

Of utmost importance is constant vigilance in maintaining your intellectual integrity and the high standards which your profession calls upon you to uphold: Thou shalt not bear tales but shall guard thy patient's confidence; thou shalt not gamble with a patient's life; thou shalt scrupulously avoid the temptation to let moneymaking and cupidity supplant ethics—the ethics with which I know you are now imbued. Nourish and hold fast to the ideals which led you to enter the medical profession; the ideals which won for medicine universal recognition as the most idealistic of all the secular professions.

Another challenge to you as individuals is the responsibility of understanding the importance of the cross-fertilization of knowledge and of the necessity for close and continuing contact between practitioner and scientist that is the hallmark of today's medicine.

My father once illustrated the importance of the relationship between doctor and scientist by telling me how in 1864 Joseph Lister, walking home with the professor of chemistry, Thomas Anderson, heard of certain papers on fermentation and putrefaction which had been recently published by a then little-known French chemist, Pasteur. Lister read these papers and found himself convinced that minute living particles floating in the air often turned the surgery of his day into a charnel house.

This casual meeting with Anderson, plus the reading of a newspaper article on carbolic

acid, led, in 1867, to Lister's laying down the great principles of the modern treatment of wounds.

A fourth challenge that will present itself to many of you is that of preserving the wonderful missionary spirit that characterizes so many outstanding graduates of your school—to name but a few, Drs. Clara Swain, May Selye, Sara Seward, and Anna Kugler in India; Drs. Coombs, Reifsnnyder, Root, and Fuller in China; and Dr. Rosella Sherwood Hall in Korea.

These and other vallant women missionaries, graduates of the Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, have added splendor to the traditions of women in medicine. They have shown us in this distraught world in which we live today that through personal discipline, through wisdom and compassion, we can win for our people the affection, the understanding, and the loyal support of other peoples.

Through your dedication and devotion to the ideals of your profession you will add years to the lives of our people. And when the time comes for some of your patients to leave this earth, it will be your understanding, your compassion, and your gentle ways which will convert moments of fear and anguish into moments of peace and serenity. Never forget the admonition of the gentle Joseph Lister, "Let not mercy or truth forsake thee; bind them about thy neck."

I hope that you will also accept the responsibility of encouraging more women to

enter the field of medicine. I was surprised to learn that last year, out of 28,000 students of medicine in this country, only some 1,500 were women and that the percentage of women students of medicine is now less than 5 percent of the total. We need not fewer men but more women in medicine.

Those who preceded you and passed down through the ages the traditions of women as doctors were few in number. So, relatively speaking, are you few in number. Yet your opportunities to enrich these traditions are as boundless as are the limits of today's ever-expanding world of medicine—the world you are about to enter.

On this your graduation day, as you pass through the portals of your beloved college into a profoundly challenging way of life, I wish you health, goodness, and usefulness as doctors, as scientists, as citizens, and as individuals. I pray that the blessings that befall you may be as abundant as will be the happiness I know you will bring to the lives of others.

It must ever be a glad distinction to have consecrated your lives to serve as those who have gone before have served—healing the sick and making whole the maimed, protecting the mother in childbirth and watching over the infant so newly come to this world, bringing life and health and happiness to your fellow man—following in humility and with faith in the footsteps of Him who nearly 2,000 years ago was called the Great Physician. I salute you, doctors, on the commencement of your service to mankind.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 27, 1956

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-living God, as we bow in this quiet moment dedicated to the unseen and the eternal, make vivid our abiding faith, we beseech Thee, in those deep and holy foundations which our fathers laid, lest in foolish futility in this desperate and dangerous day we attempt to build on sand instead of rock. In a day of aggression and of violence, of swift and shifting change, when the angry passions of men are bursting anew into devouring flame, enable Thy servants in this place of governance, in the discharge of great responsibilities of public trust, to be calm, confident, wise, and just, their hope in Thee as an anchor sure and steadfast.

Give us, O God, the strength to build  
The city that hath stood

Too long a dream, whose laws are love,  
Whose ways are brotherhood;  
And where the sun that shineth is  
God's grace for human good.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 26, 1956, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one

of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On June 21, 1956:

S. 1221. An act for the relief of the estate of Joseph Kelsch.

On June 22, 1956:

S. 910. An act for the relief of Lino Perez Martinez;

S. 1067. An act for the relief of Tibor Horvath; and

S. 2967. An act to amend the act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568), and for other purposes.

On June 25, 1956:

S. 1146. An act to further amend section 20 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, relating to fees of agents, attorneys, and representatives;

S. 2984. An act for the relief of Col. John A. O'Keefe;

S. 3265. An act to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for filing vessel utilization and performance reports by operators of vessels in the foreign commerce of the United States; and

S. 3857. An act to clarify section 1103 (d) of title II (Federal ship mortgage insurance) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

### COMMITTEE AND CONFERENCE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations; the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary; the Air Force Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee; and the conferees on the transit bill (S. 3073), of the Committee on the District of Columbia, were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to take action on the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Marvel A. Randol to be postmaster at Cape Girardeau, Mo., which nominating messages were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

### EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Andrew N. Overby, of the District of Columbia, to be Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

### POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for postmasters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the

postmaster nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

#### LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Under the rule, there will be a morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection with the transaction of the routine morning business be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PROPOSED PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL OFFICE SPACE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for a President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

#### PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the petition of Richard Katzenstein, of New York, N. Y., relating to the payment of social-security benefits to disabled workers who have attained the age of 50 and over, which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### RESOLUTION OF DEPARTMENT OF TEXAS, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Department of Texas, Disabled American Veterans, at Galveston, Tex., protesting against the enactment of the bill (H. R. 7089) to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"RESOLUTION NO. 29, DECLARING OUR TOTAL OPPOSITION AND REJECTION OF ALL THE PROVISIONS OF THE HARDY BILL, H. R. 7089, PASSED BY THE LOWER HOUSE OF CONGRESS JULY 13, 1955, UNDER THE 'GAG RULE' WHICH PREVENTED ANY CHANGES OR AMENDMENTS FROM THE FLOOR, AND WHICH IS NOW AWAITING SENATE ACTION IN THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE, AND CALLING UPON UNITED STATES SENATE TO DEFEAT THIS BILL

"Whereas over a year ago we learned that there had been created in the House of Representatives the Select Committee on Survivors Benefits, and which was given unusual scope of authority that cut across and took over the jurisdiction of 3 or 4 other standing committees of the House of Representatives, including the World War Veterans Committee, on the matter of survivors benefits, and which committee held extensive hearings over a period of 9 months, and which select committee introduced H. R. 7089, and secured a special rule, known as the 'gag rule' which only permitted debate, but prevented any amendments or changes in the bill by other Members of Congress, who at the time the bill was considered on the floor in many instances strongly objected to the tactics used under the procedure, and further objected to the contents of the bill; and

"Whereas the national convention of the Disabled American Veterans meeting in Des Moines, Iowa, in August 1955, after careful consideration and full debate rejected resolutions that were designed to approve the Hardy bill, and adopted in their place convention Resolution No. 315, declaring all-out and total opposition to H. R. 7089 as a 'one-package deal' to which the DAV gave a 'one-package rejection,' and

"Whereas the Hardy bill, H. R. 7089, contains some very radical departures and changes from the basic legislation now in force providing for both live veterans and survivors of veterans, and these radical proposals would among other things lay the groundwork for the destruction and elimination of the Veterans' Administration as a Government agency with the goal in hidden form to turn the administration of these benefits over to the Social Security Division of the Federal Government, and when the mask was pulled off of this disguised plan, the DAV found objections as follows:

"1. The bill would put death benefits and death compensation on the basis of rank and length of service and thereby set up a caste system in America beyond the grave. To gain favor for this they offered a bait to increase widow's death compensation, but a private's widow would only receive \$122 per month while the general's widow would receive \$242, and in order to get it they would steal the death compensation now paid by the Veterans' Administration to the children of a service-connected veteran where the mother is alive, and the children would be transferred over under social security, and which fact is not mentioned in the bill, and constitutes part of the 'big lie' technique, and under the present system the widow with minor children draws both death compensation for herself and minor children through the VA and social security at the same time if her deceased husband was covered.

"2. The bill proposes to put social security into the military service on a contributory basis. It was the DAV's belief that this would destroy the fighting morale of the military men and women so needed in time of war.

"3. The bill and the hearings of record behind the bill treats the fathers and mothers of deceased veterans disgracefully, and very

much as though they had no right to any benefit whatsoever from the loss of their son or daughter unless they could show by stringent statutory requirements a 'need' amounting almost to pauperism.

"4. The bill proposes equal status and evaluation for peacetime service with its minimum dangers on the same basis as wartime service with its extreme extra hazards against life and limb. This is a depreciation of all sense of values, but it is made a part of the bill to form a part of the plot or pattern for the 'one-package deal.'

"5. The bill proposes to abolish insurance protection as a statutory benefit, and invoke another instance of the 'big lie' technique by combining the present indemnity insurance with death compensation, and thereby make it appear that they are actually increasing death compensation, when in reality they are taking away another very important benefit.

"6. The bill proposes to tie in one package the long-honored death compensation to Government insurance, and to use social security as an offset against the widow with minor children, which would materially reduce the overall benefits payable to the widow and minor children of the deceased servicemen called in the war's emergency and serving in the enlisted ranks.

"7. We oppose H. R. 7089 and its program of oversimplification for the reason that the military services should be free and unencumbered by any other Government or civilian agency, and that by placing social security into the Armed Forces on a compulsory basis will subject the members of the Armed Forces to fear and duress, and that before long the social-security people will be telling the military leaders how to run the Armed Forces.

"8. We in the DAV oppose the bill H. R. 7089 for the reason that the Select Committee on Survivors Benefits failed to provide for the continuation of one of the most important of survivors benefits adopted by the Congress on June 28, 1934, in Public Law 484, 73d Congress, and which the DAV fostered, and which provided for reduced rates of compensation in cases where the cause of death was not shown to have arisen from or to have been contributed to by the service-connected disability and, as a matter of fact, about 85 or 90 percent of all death benefits are paid under this act, even at the present time, as amended, and that a false picture has been created as only a small portion of cases die of their service-connected disability, which fact the high brass of the Pentagon may wake up to later on as they constitute about 4 percent of the beneficiaries against 96 percent of the citizen soldiers.

"9. We oppose H. R. 7089 because it provides for only one application for death benefits under both the Veterans' Administration and the social-security division, and it could be filed initially with either agency, and that this feature constitutes the real boobytrap whereby the social-security people hope to take over the Veterans' Administration because a veteran's power of attorney dies when he dies, and the social-security outfit gets a notice of death prior, in most instances, to the Veterans' Administration, and the widow and dependent would have no representation before the Veterans' Administration and, in the final analysis, it is also designed to eliminate veterans' representatives of veterans' organizations.

"10. The bill H. R. 7089 was opposed further for the reason that it has been uncovered that social security is not actually an insurance, and that there is no social security trust fund in fact, and that the money has all been spent for deficit spending and foreign aid and other Government projects,

since the United States Supreme Court has held that social-security deductions are only a tax, and that on top of this the planners of the social-security project could also incorporate into social security the civil-service retirement, in which the Government has already defaulted on their portion of the fund in the amount of over \$6 billion, and the planners openly state that it will not be necessary then for the Government to make up that money, and to make up the money that is already owed for the stopgap social security placed in the military service during World War II in the amount of approximately \$35 million. That the social-security program is now overloaded and that there is actually \$15 billion less than nothing in the so-called social security trust fund at the present time, and that is only on paper.

"11. We oppose H. R. 7089 for the reason that the whole plan undertakes to put both the citizen soldier and the career soldier under the whiplash and compulsion of compulsory social security and to deny to the citizen soldier the prerogatives of free enterprise and to scale all his benefits down to one benefit to be determined by the lowest common denominator which is social security and their program, and it is our belief that the citizen soldier should have as many types of endeavor and enterprise as his energies and his talents may lead him into, and that the old-fashioned virtues of thrift and ambition should not be stifled or held down by this fear and compulsion of a socialistic state in which human liberty and human freedom will quickly evaporate and be lost; and

"Whereas we only suspected parts of what we now know in full, and which have confirmed our sound judgment in rejecting the Hardy bill, H. R. 7089, because that bill was part of a master plot, and it constituted the advance groundwork to snare the uninformed and the veterans who could be fooled, but their timetable got fouled up and they were not able to jam through the Senate this H. R. 7089 as they had hoped and planned upon before the release of the report of the President's Commission on Pensions and now the whole plot is crystal clear, and the pattern takes on a full form in the recommendation of the President's Commission as follows:

"21. This Commission strongly approves of the system of survivors benefits that would be established by H. R. 7089, as it would, in a large measure, correct serious deficiencies in existing situations."

"The whole plot of the Bureau of the Budget was to lay the basic groundwork through the select committee in H. R. 7089 upon which the subsequent recommendations of the President's Commission to make further drastic reductions and curtailment in veterans' benefits could be carried out; and

"Whereas it is our belief that the Hardy bill, H. R. 7089, should be defeated in the United States Senate, and that the veterans throughout the United States of America should be aroused and informed of the plan and plot to scuttle their historic rights and benefits, all to make available more funds for foreign giveaway programs and to care for the enemies, who in fact disabled many of our comrades, and which is the program of the international Socialists who want to set up a super world federation of governments in which the United States would surrender part of its sovereignty, and before long we would be sharing everything we've got with the socialistic countries of the world, and it is our belief that the basic statutory rights which Congress has heretofore provided for disabled veterans and their dependents is part of the cost of war, and that the veteran and his dependent is entitled to be treated as a separate class in this respect,

and that social security and any other benefit are only collateral and supplementary thereto, and if the veteran and his dependents are entitled to benefits under social security by virtue of having qualified under that law by contributions from his own pay and the contributions of his employer, then in that event the social security benefits should also be paid simultaneously with the payment of benefits accruing under veterans legislation, without any setoff, deduction, or merging with social security, and that the fiction or fantasy that is sought to be created by clever phrases and manipulations to reduce veterans down to the lowest common denominator of one social security benefit deprives them of the human dignity established in the Declaration of Independence and perfected in the Constitution of the United States of America: Therefore be it

"Resolved, by the Department of Texas, Disabled American Veterans, in State convention assembled at Galveston, Tex., June 8, 9, and 10, 1956, That we hereby go on record expressing our total disapproval and opposition to the legislative proposals contained in the Hardy bill H. R. 7089 now awaiting action before the Senate Finance Committee of the United States Senate, and that it is our belief that this bill was too hastily considered and cuts across too many existing Federal laws to be workable, and that it was 'railroaded' through the lower House of Congress under a 'gag rule' that was both undemocratic and unfair to the other Members of that House of Congress, many of whom were the long and proven friends of the disabled veterans and their dependents, and who held strong and different views that the five men on the select committee, and many of whom prophesied that the bill would be the end of the Veterans' Administration, and in speeches on the floor stated that the bill neither was fair to the veterans nor did the tactics that were being used to ram it through the House of Representatives reflect any faith and confidence of its proponents in the merits of the bill; and be it further

"Resolved, That we hereby call upon the Members of the United States Senate to defeat H. R. 7089 and to leave the present basic laws covering veterans benefits and those of dependents in force without changing the basic philosophy of the long history of our Government in the past in this regard, and in doing this prevent one group of veterans being set against another group of veterans, and one group of fathers and mothers being set against another group of fathers and mothers, and discrimination between widows in the amount of their death compensation based upon the rank of a deceased husband which sets up a caste system beyond the grave; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be presented by the delegates from the State of Texas to the national convention of the Disabled American Veterans at San Antonio, Tex., August 19-24, 1956, and there requesting its adoption as a mandate of that convention as part of the national legislative program, and a declaration of the policy of the Disabled American Veterans; and be it further

"Resolved, That the State adjutant as secretary of this convention be, and he is hereby instructed to prepare at once additional copies of this resolution in the proper number and that the same be forwarded to the national adjutant at national headquarters, Cincinnati, Ohio, and that separate copies thereof be forwarded by him at once to each Member of the United States Senate, and that a further copy be sent to each Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Texas, and that further copies to be sent to each member of the Committee

on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives."

The foregoing resolution unanimously adopted this 10th day of June 1956.

JOE F. RAMSEY, Jr.,  
State Commander.

Attest:

H. V. ROYSTON,  
State Adjutant.

#### RESOLUTIONS OF NORTH DAKOTA STATE CONVENTION OF DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of resolutions adopted by the State convention of the Disabled American Veterans, at Minot, N. Dak., May 25-27, 1956.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### "RESOLUTION FOR INCREASED COMPENSATION

"Whereas veterans service-connected disability ratings and death compensation has not kept pace with the increased cost of living since World War II; and

"Whereas disabled veterans and dependents are finding it increasingly difficult to meet the meager essentials of living and in fact some veterans and their dependents are destitute and must receive welfare aid wherever and if they are able to obtain it; and

"Whereas it is an obligation and duty of the people of this Nation and Congress to give top priority to the wartime disabled veterans over any other class or group: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That this State convention of the Disabled American Veterans assembled at Minot, N. Dak., May 25, 26, and 27, 1956, go on record requesting that a 20 percent increase in disability compensation and death compensation be granted; and be it further

"Resolved, That we urge our national convention and our Congressmen to support legislation for increased service-connected disability ratings and death compensation."

Passed by the DAV convention in Minot, N. Dak., May 26, 1956.

MAX FOERSTER,  
Department Adjutant.

##### "RESOLUTION REGARDING DEPENDENCY ALLOWANCE

"Whereas it has been the policy of the Disabled American Veterans to have all disabled veterans treated equally and correct discriminatory legislation; and

"Whereas under existing laws and regulations of the Veterans' Administration pertaining to dependency allowance, a veteran rated from 10 percent through 40 percent receives no additional allowance; and

"Whereas veterans rated 50 to 100 percent receive additional allowance for dependents: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That this convention of the DAV of North Dakota, assembled at Minot, N. Dak., May 25, 26, and 27, 1956, hereby respectfully request and urge Congress to amend Public Law 877, 80th Congress, to provide that dependency allowance be included and also paid to veterans rated from 10 percent through 40 percent."

Passed by the DAV Convention in Minot, N. Dak., May 26, 1956.

MAX FOERSTER,  
Department Adjutant.

##### "RESOLUTION IN OPPOSITION TO CURTAILMENT OF MEDICAL TREATMENT AS NOW AUTHORIZED IN VA HOSPITALS

"Whereas it has come to our attention through the records of the press that the

American Medical Association and other organizations have called upon the Congress to enact such laws as are necessary to end the free medical care now received by the veterans in VA hospitals for non-service-connected cases; and

"Whereas only a short time ago the said American Medical Association did solicit and receive help from the various national veterans organizations to defeat a bill creating socialized medicine; and

"Whereas under the plans as advanced by the American Medical Association it would be impossible for hundreds of thousands of veterans to receive proper medical attention as a very small percentage of such veterans are financially able to finance such proper medical attention as now received: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, by the DAV Convention assembled in Minot, N. Dak., May 25, 26, 27, 1956, That if and when such legislation as suggested by the American Medical Association is introduced for passage that we request our Senators and Representatives to oppose such passage.*

Passed by the DAV Convention in Minot, N. Dak., May 26, 1956.

MAX FOERSTER,  
Department Adjutant.

**"RESOLUTION OPPOSING TRANSFER OF VA FUNCTIONS TO ANY OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCY"**

"Whereas the VA has been operating successfully in the field of administering laws pertaining to veterans for over 25 years: Therefore be it

*Resolved, That the DAV, Department of North Dakota, in convention assembled May 25, 26, 27, 1956, go on record as opposing any move to transfer any VA activities to any other governmental agency, and that VA continue to be operated exclusively for veterans rights and benefits; and be it further*

*Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to other veterans organizations for their support and also copies of this resolution be forwarded to our North Dakota Senators and Representatives."*

Passed by the DAV Convention in Minot, N. Dak., May 26, 1956.

MAX FOERSTER,  
Department Adjutant.

**"RESOLUTION"**

"Whereas Senate bill 3067 provides a 1-year period during which certain veterans be granted the right to obtain National Service Life Insurance; and

"Whereas we of the DAV assembled in the 36th annual convention at Minot, N. Dak., are firm believers in the great value of National Service Life Insurance: Therefore, be it

*Resolved, That we urge the passage of Senate bill 3067; and be it further*

*Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our North Dakota Senators and Representatives urging their support of this Senate bill."*

Passed by the DAV Convention in Minot, N. Dak., May 26, 1956.

MAX FOERSTER,  
Department Adjutant.

**"RESOLUTION—PROCEEDS OF COMMERCIAL LIFE INSURANCE BE NOT CONSIDERED AS INCOME IN DETERMINING PENSION BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENTS OF DECEASED VETERANS"**

"Whereas commercial life insurance paid to a beneficiary upon the death of a veteran is considered as income for death pension purposes; and

"Whereas this matured commercial life insurance is merely a return for premium payments made by the veteran during his lifetime; and

"Whereas the proceeds of such matured commercial life insurance paid to widows

creates a bar to entitlement to death pension benefits; and

"Whereas in most cases where matured commercial life insurance is paid to widows a greater portion or sometimes all of such proceeds from this commercial life insurance is used by the widow to defray funeral, hospital, and other expenses, generally accumulated during the veterans terminal illness: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the DAV, That the Congress be memorialized to amend the insurance act to provide that commercial life insurance paid to widows be not considered for death pension purposes; and be it further*

*Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to our North Dakota Senators and Representatives."*

Passed by the DAV convention, in Minot, N. Dak., May 26, 1956.

MAX FOERSTER,  
Department Adjutant.

**"RESOLUTION ASKING THAT PENSION PAYMENTS TO WIDOWS AND DEPENDENTS OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT BE BASED ON THE SAME CRITERIA"**

"Whereas widows and dependents of World War I are entitled to pensions irrespective of whether the cause of death is due to military service or the veteran had a disability due to service at time of death; and

"Whereas widows and dependents of World War II veterans and of the Korean conflict in order to be entitled to a pension in cases where cause of death or any disability that contributed to the cause of death is not due to service, the veteran has to have a service-connected disability, disabling to an ascertainable degree at time of death; and

"Whereas it is inequitable for widows and dependents of World War I veterans to be entitled to pensions and the widows and dependents of World War II and Korean conflict veterans being denied benefits under the same circumstances or having the same qualifications: Therefore, be it

*Resolved, That suitable legislation be passed granting the same pension rights to widows and dependents of World War II and Korean veterans as now is granted to widows of World War I veterans; and be it further*

*Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to our North Dakota Senators and Representatives."*

Passed by the DAV convention, in Minot, N. Dak., May 26, 1956.

MAX FOERSTER,  
Department Adjutant.

**"RESOLUTION PERTAINING TO THE RECENTLY RELEASED BRADLEY COMMISSION REPORT"**

"Whereas it appears that the Commission created by the President known as the Bradley Commission to investigate the Veterans' Administration regarding veterans' benefits is on the whole unsatisfactory in that it appears to discriminate on proposed legislation for disabled veterans: Therefore, be it

*Resolved, That this 36th annual convention of the Disabled American Veterans of the State of North Dakota held in Minot, N. Dak., this 26th day of May 1956 go on record as opposing the President Committee report (Bradley Commission report)."*

Passed by the DAV convention, in Minot, N. Dak., May 26, 1956.

MAX FOERSTER,  
Department Adjutant.

**RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN CITIZENS OF GREEK DESCENT**

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by American citizens of Greek descent, re-

siding in Springfield, Ohio, and its environs, relating to immigration quotas.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**"RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN CITIZENS OF GREEK DESCENT RESIDING IN SPRINGFIELD, OHIO AND ENVIRONS CONCERNING UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION QUOTAS"**

"Whereas over 138 citizens of Greek descent residing in this area and suburbs are familiar with the privations and hardships of Greece from warfare, occupation, and communistic depredations of the last decade and from two destructive earthquakes within past 2 years and those Americans and their friends are cognizant of the inequities from national origins system of immigration and Refugee Relief Act of 1953; and

"Whereas the prevailing United States immigration laws are clearly discriminatory inasmuch as they assign northern and western Europe five-sixths of migration quotas and to southern and eastern nations only one-sixth; and as aptly stated by Secretary Dulles, this system 'draws distinction between the blood of another (which) cannot be reconciled with the fundamental concepts of our Declaration of Independence'; and

"Whereas State Department reports show over 14,000 Greek assurances still pending and without visas; and

"Whereas the economy of Greece is in an increasingly precarious state as a result of overpopulation and of depletion through her recurrent for liberation, for freedom, and for democracy from 1911 until 1947 wars; and

"Whereas immigrants from Greece, within past 50 years, have been assimilated with unrivaled rapidity and thoroughness in the United States of America and now with their children and grandchildren, aggregating over 1,250,000 citizens, are amongst the most respected, prominent, law-abiding, home-loving, loyal, and progressive Americans and American patriots, having proven as such in every endeavor, civil and military; and

"Whereas historic friendships, existing between United States of America and Greece, is predicated upon mutual devotion to the tenets of democracy and liberty, to the principles of the dignity and freedom of the individual, and to the culture of western civilizations, founded in ancient Greece, and now flowering intensively and illuminatively in America; and

"Whereas these two countries fought side by side in two great World Wars since the days when each gained its independence; and

"Whereas within the last decade, evidencing its interest in Greece, the United States of America, through the Marshall plan and Truman doctrine, aided decisively in the preservation of Greece within the orbit of western nations, for which people are most grateful; and

"Whereas Greeks have demonstrated repeatedly their loyalty as allies of western nations and their exemplary courage as a freedom-loving people by resisting heroically the mighty axis forces in 1940-41, and by exterminating vile communistic forces in 1944-47; and

"Whereas Greece, lying athwart the eastern terminus of the Mediterranean Basin, is strategically the controlling gateway of sea, air, land, and fuel-oil routes among three continents (Europe, Asia, and Africa), and because of its geographical location, Greece is the master hinge of NATO, Balkan, Baghdad, and SEATO defensive systems, and as such, an indispensable bastion for the security of western democracies:

*"It is resolved by the undersigned, personally and collectively, That our Representatives in Congress, both Senators and Congressmen, be and hereby are respectfully urged and appealed to, to take timely and*

appropriate action in urging the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER, chairman, Subcommittee on Refugee Relief Program; the Honorable JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee; the Honorable FRANCIS WALTER, chairman, House Immigration Subcommittee; and the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman, House Judiciary Committee—

"(A) To expedite and support legislation for additional Greek refugee quotas by transferring an additional 10,000 visas for Greece from unused and undersubscribed quotas (and 10,000 or more for Italy); but not increase the overall total of 209,000 under entire refugee program, such transfer being within humanitarian spirit and purposes of prevailing immigration laws; and further

"(B) To support the effectuation of the amendments of present immigration laws, beneficially to Greece and Italy, both members of NATO, and particularly support the enactment of legislation within the contemplation of pending bills S. 3574 and S. 3876;

"(C) That copies of this resolution signed by officials of the Greek-American organizations and representative citizens be transmitted to the Honorable John Bricker, the Honorable George Bender, our United States Senators; and the Honorable Clarence Brown, our Congressman; and the Honorable William Langer, the Honorable James O. Eastland, the Honorable Emanuel Celler, the Honorable Francis Walter, Gov. Frank Lausche, and to the press."

Respectfully submitted.

Dated June 8, 1956.

Unanimously adopted in general community meeting.

Chairman.

Attest:

Gregory Speras, Secretary, Springfield Chapter No. 247, Order of AHEPA; George Keriobes, President, Hellenic Eastern Orthodox Church; Mary Katicifas, President, Hellenic Ladies Society; Olga Doney, President, Maids of Athens Chapter; Rev. George V. Dellaz, Pastor, Eastern Orthodox Church; George Gianokopoulos, President, Chapter No. 247, Order of AHEPA; Eugenia Grigiss, President, Hellenic Orthodox Sunday School Faculty; Georgia Giannakopoulos, President, Chapter No. —, Daughters of Penelope in U. S. A.

#### TERMINATION OF CONTROL OVER KLAMATH INDIAN RESERVATION— RESOLUTION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the Indian Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] had a report on the progress of Public Law 587, which provides termination of the Federal control of the Klamath Reservation. At that hearing, attended by management specialists charged with drawing up plans for the implementation of this termination law, we again were made aware that the problem of disposing of one of America's finest stands of Ponderosa pine timber, found on this reservation, was posing a real problem for the specialists.

Indicative of the general concern attending the administration of Public Law 587 is the resolution drawn at the recent annual meeting of the Oregon State Grange. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### RESOLUTION NO. 19

Whereas Oregon State Grange is deeply concerned for the welfare of the Indian people of our State in general and of the Klamath Indian people in particular, believing that Public Law 587 does not provide the best program for handling the affairs of the Klamath Indians; and

Whereas early termination could bring hardship because of lack of explanation and confusion concerning the terms of the law in reference to guardianship, so every adult should know and understand section 15; and

Whereas the stated purpose of House Concurrent Resolution 108 declares it to be the policy of Congress to terminate all Federal responsibility for Indians at the earliest possible date. The avowed purpose is to bring about the integration of the Indian people with the rest of our people; and

Whereas 6 termination bills have been passed by the Congress, but only 2, 1 dealing with the Menominees, of Wisconsin, and the other with the Klamaths, of Oregon, have been pushed. Significantly, the Menominees and the Klamaths own two of the finest remaining stands of timber in the United States; and

Whereas the Klamath Indian Reservation at the present time is very rich in timber and grazing land resources. These resources if held in trust for the Klamaths and wisely developed and administered, will afford a good standard of living for the members of the Klamath Tribes for the foreseeable future; and

Whereas there is no valid reason why the Indian people cannot attain complete integration and still maintain tribal membership and tribal ownership of the Indian reservations; and

Whereas the National Congress of American Indians, over a year ago, set up a nine-point program which contains "a plan of positive action to alleviate the present poverty, lack of education and training, and the present ill health of the country's 450,000 Indians." Basically the plan rests on the Indian belief that, given full conservation and development of resources, reservations will in time be able to support the people who wish to remain on them, and Federal responsibility will become superfluous; and

Whereas this plan would hold in trust the Indian's heritage and keep in Indian ownership the remnant of the land and resources that we have allowed the Indians to keep until now: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That House Concurrent Resolution 108 and all of the termination bills passed to date, including Public Law 587 dealing with the Klamaths be repealed; and be it further

*Resolved*, That legislation be enacted to implement the nine-point program drafted by the National Congress of American Indians, and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to Oregon's congressional delegation, the Department of Interior, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the National Grange.

#### FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION—LETTER

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, congressional action on a bill providing Federal aid to school construction now seems a definite possibility.

This is very encouraging news. I know from the plight of school districts in my State of Michigan alone how vitally necessary it is to have prompt action.

I have received letter after letter from school officials, and I have had numerous

personal contacts with them. All urge me to do everything in my power to bring about the enactment of the school-aid bill.

From the many letters I have received, I should like to have printed in the RECORD one from R. L. Collins, treasurer of the school district in Nankin-Dearborn Township, which is just outside Detroit.

This letter points out clearly the difficulties the school districts are facing, and it is a typical picture of many areas in my State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 20, 1956.

HON. PATRICK V. McNAMARA,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McNAMARA: It is my understanding that Congress will be considering the subject of Federal aid to education in the near future. Because our school district typifies the suburban "bedroom" areas of Wayne County, perhaps an explanation of our situation and the need for Federal aid will be of assistance to you in your deliberations.

The Cherry Hill School District comprises an area of 2½ square miles just west of Dearborn. Prior to 1950, it was farmland with one 6-room school serving the entire area. However, at about that time, small home developments began with the result that our school membership has been increasing at about 30 percent each year over the previous year.

School year:	Elementary membership
1951-52	575
1952-53	723
1953-54	975
1954-55	1,222
1955-56	1,485
1956-57 (estimated)	2,000

Of course, the tax base of the district has been increasing, too. Assessed valuation is almost entirely composed of residential property—with an average home being assessed in the range of \$4,000-\$4,500. We have no industrial tax base, and only limited commercial property.

	Assessed valuation
1951-52	\$2,100,000
1952-53	3,600,000
1953-54	5,400,000
1954-55	7,600,000
1955-56	9,500,000
1956-57	11,600,000

During this period our facilities investments have totaled about \$1½ million, and just last week the community voted an additional \$2 million bond issue for further work.

Briefly, the above data is a summary of where we've been—now for the future load:

School census statistics show a 4,000-pupil membership by 1961. To house these children will take approximately \$4 million over and above the expenditures now authorized—including a high school. (Over 150 children are now taken into Dearborn each day for high school—more than 200 next fall.)

Maximum forecasted tax base will be about \$18 million assessed valuation, not sufficient to support the bond retirement requirements for such a program. Our new bond issue will put our outstanding debt at about \$3.1 million—about 30 percent of assessed valuation, and principal retirements can average only about \$80,000 annually. A locally sponsored

program would necessitate a debt ratio in 1959-60 of over 40 percent for school purposes only.

Clearly we are going to need help. While Michigan will loan us money to pay our debt costs, our program as now existing will require a \$90,000 loan in 1956-57 alone to meet our obligations. The loan method does not add to our total resources—merely helps in meeting short-term peaks.

The people of our community are making real sacrifices today to face up to our needs. (The recent bond issue passed 310 to 8.) Our school tax load alone is over 30 mills—and to this must be added the village and county taxes.

Consolidation is not an answer to our problem, since neighboring school districts are in identical financial straits—Garden City to our north, Inkster to the south, Wayne to the west (and why should Dearborn people take us). We have earnestly studied such plans, but find that pooling our financial problems does not offer any advantage.

All in all, ours is a difficult situation. We've studied it carefully, the people have made sacrifices, we are doing our best, but the cold hard fact is that the toddlers of today will be school children tomorrow, and we just don't have the money nor foreseeable local resources to house them.

We've had Federal aid—about \$225,000 altogether in the past 3 years. We're thankful for your efforts in our behalf previously—because needed classrooms were thus made available. But we need more—lots more—to keep our heads above water. We're hoping that your current deliberations will result in the assistance which is so essential to our job of educating our children.

We know we can count on you.

Sincerely,

R. L. COLLINS,

Treasurer, School District No. 2 for Nankin-Dearborn Townships.

P. S.—It is our feeling that the Powell amendment is unnecessary and that conformity to the Supreme Court decision regarding nonsegregation can and should be handled in administrative procedures. It seems to us that such an amendment is redundant—and its inclusion can only obscure the real need which must be met. Let's get school aid, then work out the mechanics concerning to whom it will be distributed—all in accord with the basic patterns established for our democracy.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1450. A bill for the relief of Mary C. Frederick (Rept. No. 2374); and

H. R. 1072. An act for the relief of Clyde M. Litton (Rept. No. 2371).

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 7663. An act to provide for settlement in part of certain claims of the Uintah and White River Bands of Ute Indians in Court of Claims case numbered 47568, through restoration of subsurface rights in certain lands formerly a part of the Uintah Indian Reservation (Rept. No. 2372).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

H. R. 5690. An act for the relief of Camp Kooch-i-ching (Rept. No. 2373).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 2167. A bill to make certain changes in the administration of the Panama Canal Company, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2375).

#### REPORT ENTITLED "INFLUENCE OF CARGO PREFERENCE STATUTES ON THE SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL DISPOSAL PROGRAM" (S. REPT. NO. 2376)

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, submitted a report entitled "Influence of Cargo Preference Statutes on the Surplus Agricultural Disposal Program," which was ordered to be printed.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 4124. A bill to amend section 303 of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, so as to make certain persons who were citizens of the United States on the date of the enactment of such section eligible to file claims thereunder; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 4125. A bill for the relief of Wong Sau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 4126. A bill for the relief of Maria Sabatino;

S. 4127. A bill for the relief of Pedro Ampo;

S. 4128. A bill for the relief of Maria Concetta Di Turi;

S. 4129. A bill for the relief of Maria Lorenz; and

S. 4130. A bill for the relief of Genovaite Musinkas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 4131. A bill for the relief of Maja Veara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 4132. A bill to establish a teaching hospital for Howard University, to transfer Freedmen's Hospital to the university, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 4133. A bill for the relief of Livio Senni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 4134. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Filipina Huber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. SCHOEPEL, and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 4135. A bill amending the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to permit deductions for a self-help beef promotion program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. J. Res. 185. Joint resolution to amend the act of August 20, 1954, establishing a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### RESOLUTIONS

The following resolution was submitted and referred as indicated:

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LANGER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. MORSE):

S. Res. 298. Resolution opposing discriminatory action against United States citizens because of religious faith or affiliations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

#### PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 299), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved by the Senate, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary not more than 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held by the Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency in the United States, on July 15 and 16, 1955, pursuant to Senate Resolution 62 of the 1st session of the 84th Congress, on Juvenile Delinquency (Interstate Adoption Practices).*

#### CONTROL OF PRODUCTION CREDIT ASSOCIATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SCHOEPEL submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 10285) to merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for supervision of production credit associations; and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, which is now pending before the Senate. I ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. President, I had previously submitted this amendment and it was printed, but the amendment was to H. R. 10082, with an identical title, and the bill as reported out by the Senate is now H. R. 11356. Further, I am making one or two very minor changes in the amendment. Therefore, I am resubmitting it and ask that it be printed so that Members of the Senate may have the correct amendment before them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11356, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11356, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. WOFFORD) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 11356, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South

Carolina, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. SCOTT) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 11356, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS — CHANGE OF CONFERENCE

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, it was

*Ordered*, That the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] be excused from further service as a conferee on the part of the Senate on the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

#### PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON GRAND RIVER, MICH. (S. DOC. NO. 132)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated May 14, 1956, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Grand River, Mich., with particular reference to flood control in the vicinity of Lansing, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works of July 15, 1947. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON OSWEGO RIVER WATERSHED, AUBURN, N. Y. (S. DOC. NO. 133)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated May 11, 1956, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on Oswego River watershed at Auburn, N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works of September 18, 1951. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PAYMENTS TO CERTAIN INDIANS — STAR PRINT OF REPORT

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Mr. President, on yesterday, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I reported favorably, with amendments, Calendar No. 2393, the bill (S. 3397) to amend section 3 of the act of May 19, 1947 (ch. 80, 61 Stat. 102), as amended, for the purpose of extending the time in which payments are to be made to members of the Shoshone Tribe and the Arapahoe Tribe of the Wind River Reser-

vation in Wyoming, and for other purposes. By reason of an inadvertent error made yesterday in submitting the report, I ask unanimous consent that a corrected star print be made of the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM—POLITICAL COMPLEXION OF CONGRESS

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, in his final television appearance in the 1954 campaign, President Eisenhower urged the Nation to elect a Republican Congress. In spite of his warning in 1954, there was too much complacency. When he announced that he would seek a second term, he again reiterated the need for a Republican Congress. The following is taken from the transcript of his press conference of February 29:

RICHARD L. WILSON (of Cowles Publications). Mr. President, do you consider the lack of Republican control of Congress to be a handicap to your administration?

President EISENHOWER. That is what I believe; if we are honestly dedicated to a two-party system, that is, to a single party responsibility in this country, then the legislature and the Executive should properly be in the same hands so that there can be responsibility fixed without crimination or recrimination.

The Democrats organized the present 84th Congress in January 1955, and are responsible for its record.

Many columnists hailed this development after the 1954 elections, as they said the Democrats would support the President's program with more vigor than would the Republicans. As the present Congress draws to a close, the record clearly shows what has been accomplished. Very little of the President's extensive domestic program has been enacted into law. Much of it has never even been debated.

Within a few months the American people will once again have an opportunity to elect a President and a Congress. The reelection of President Eisenhower is almost a foregone conclusion. However, he will not be able to accomplish his objectives for the benefit of the American people unless they give him a Republican Congress when they go to the polls in November.

Raymond Moley, in the July 2 issue of Newsweek, published today, reviews the support accorded to the President's program by members of his own party and by the Democrats. His article clearly shows that the Republican Members of this body went down the line for the President on those issues which really mattered, and that little support was accorded his program by the Democrats. I shall bring Mr. Moley's analysis to the attention of the voters in those States where a Senatorial contest will take place this fall, so that they will clearly understand why the President needs a Republican Senate in January 1957.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Moley's article may be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PARTY RULE IN SENATE (By Raymond Moley)

Liberals, who would have President Eisenhower as their very own, repudiate any suggestion that he might be a loyal Republican and a believer in a 2-party government. In their anxiety to injure the Republican Party they would destroy party government and exalt the independent, both at the polls and in Congress. Hence they would like to prove that support for the President is just as great among Democrats as among Republicans in Congress, and that bipartisanship, which really means a no-party system, is a state of affairs devoutly to be wished.

Incidentally, those people who used to call themselves liberals—a name stolen by collectivists from the traditional and genuine believers in individualism—have now stolen the word "moderate." It is more popular now, they believe. They would steal the livery of the right to serve the left.

The President, however, is wiser than these false friends. In May he offered this testimonial of his belief in party government and party loyalty:

"I am a Republican in our 2-party system. Consequently, to do that work best, I think it is only logical that the people you give to me as my closest associates—if that responsibility is again laid upon me—be bound to me by terms of party loyalty as well as official and personal loyalty. I think it is quite clear that in that way we preserve the integrity of the 2-party system and make it possible to hold one single party responsible for anything that happens within the Federal Government."

#### VITAL DIVISIONS

The facts bear out this view that the President needs strong party support in the next Congress. He cannot depend upon Democratic help.

A study has been made available to me which shows the vitality of party government in the Congress. I offer the Senate analysis here, and next week that of the House.

In the Senate there were 270 yeas and nay votes in the 83d Congress, and 88 in the first session of the 84th Congress. However, there were only 78 and 24 respectively in which the parties were really divided. These issues were all of vital importance to the Eisenhower administration.

My criterion of a party division in a roll call in which the respective leaders and the policy committees of the 2 parties are on opposite sides.

The total positions taken by all Senators who voted or announced where they stood on the 78 divided issues in the 83d Congress were 6,915. Republicans following their party leadership accounted for 2,999 of these, and Democrats loyal to their leadership accounted for 2,818. Republicans voting with the opposition accounted for 490 positions, and Democrats supporting Republican leadership, 608.

The same pattern is found in the rollcalls of the first session of the 84th Congress. There were 2,195 positions taken on the 24 issues that really mattered. Republican leadership received the support of Senators taking 870 positions. Democratic leadership had 953 votes. Republican and Democratic votes which crossed the party lines were 199 and 173, respectively.

#### RELIABLE SUPPORTERS

It is a commonplace among commentators who fail to examine the facts to say that certain Democrats are more reliable supporters of the President's party than are many Republicans. That is not true. Senator McCARTHY stands third from the bottom of

the list of members of his party supporting the leadership. But at that he is tied with two Democrats who are regarded as conservative supporters of Eisenhower—BYRD and ROBERTSON of Virginia.

When the chips were down, Senator SMITH of New Jersey never deviated. Senators BRIDGES, HICKENLOOPER, MARTIN of Pennsylvania, MARTIN of Iowa, MILLIKIN, SALTONSTALL, SCHOEPEL, and WATKINS deviated only once.

On the other side of the Senate, the stalwarts were SPARKMAN, O'MAHONEY, MURRAY, MANSFIELD, LEHMAN, KILGORE, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, HAYDEN, HUMPHREY, HILL, FULBRIGHT, HENNINGS, DOUGLAS, CLEMENTS, and BARKLEY. Each of these deviated only once.

Thus party lines do make a difference. There could be no stronger argument than the foregoing analysis of Senate rollcalls for giving the President a Republican Congress at the coming election.

#### DEDICATION OF PLAQUE TO THE MEMORY OF THOSE WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN THE FIGHTING IN KOREA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in New York on Thursday, June 21, in the presence of the highest officials of the United Nations, a bronze plaque was dedicated in the great public concourse at United Nations Headquarters to the memory of the men who lost their lives in the fighting in Korea.

In attendance were the Secretary General of the United Nations, His Excellency Dag Hammarskjöld; the President of the Security Council, His Excellency Dr. E. Ronald Walker of Australia; all of the representatives of the 16 nations which contributed to Korea; representatives of the military forces of many of these countries; the representatives of the Republic of Korea; and many others.

The representative of the United States of America, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., spoke on behalf of the Unified Command, which was exercised by the United States in Korea, both for member nations and for the Republic of Korea.

He was accompanied by Vice Adm. Arthur D. Struble, United States Navy, chairman of the United States delegation to the United Nations Military Staff Committee, who had commanded the naval forces at the landing at Inchon, in Korea; by Ambassador James J. Wadsworth; and by Minister James W. Barco, of the United States mission to the United Nations.

There was 1 minute of silent prayer.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the statements which were made on this occasion by the Secretary General, the President of the Security Council, and the representative of the United States of America.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEDICATION OF MEMORIAL PLAQUE IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE MEN WHO DIED IN KOREA IN THE SERVICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS, UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS, JUNE 21, 1956

REMARKS BY MR. DAG HAMMARSKJÖLD, SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. President and Excellencies, we meet here to dedicate this plaque inscribed "in

grateful remembrance of the men of the Armed Forces of member states who died in Korea in the service of the United Nations 1950-1953."

"In grateful remembrance of the men"—it is the individuals we honor with this plaque. But it is fitting that the organization in whose service they gave their lives; is here represented first by the President of the Security Council which assumed the main responsibility. Those who gave their lives came from many countries. Ambassador Lodge is on this occasion representing not only those from his own country—as we know they were the great majority—but all who made their personal sacrifice, irrespective of their nationality.

An occasion such as this one is a poignant reminder that behind every historic action, national or international, is the individual human being, each giving of his courage and his devotion. Those whom we honor today were called upon by their governments to fight, as loyal citizens of their own countries, for a common cause. In devoted service they made the supreme sacrifice.

To their memory it is fitting that we should pay simple and humble tribute. We cannot recall the lives they gave, and only in a small and imperfect measure can we share the grief of those they loved and left behind. But in paying them honor, we can resolve to remember always their example of selfless sacrifice. In the memory of their devotion we can find cause to renew our own. In the memory of their service, we can seek to be worthy in our lives to the building of a peace that will endure.

REMARKS BY AMBASSADOR RONALD WALKER, PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF AUSTRALIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS AND PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Mr. Secretary General, Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, we are about to unveil a memorial to the men of the United Nations forces who died in Korea. As President of the Security Council I consider it a privilege to pay tribute to those brave men who, at the call of the United Nations, took up arms to resist aggression and gave their own lives so that others might live in freedom.

The countries that contributed forces to the United Nations effort and suffered losses in Korea can of course never forget the extremely heavy sacrifices which were borne by the people of the United States, nor the leadership and generous cooperation which the United States gave to all who rallied to this United Nations cause. I consider it particularly fitting therefore that the permanent representative of the United States should also speak to us in today's ceremony on behalf of all the countries which gave the men in whose memory we dedicate this plaque.

This occasion recalls many vivid memories for me personally. As Australian representative on UNCURK last year and as Ambassador to Japan for some years, it has been my privilege to know many of the men of the various components of the United Nations forces—in Korea, in bases and hospitals in Japan, and in the United Nations Headquarters in Tokyo. These men shared a noble comradeship that transcended all differences in nationality, in tongue and in race, and will long be an inspiration to those who observed it or experienced it.

Not long ago I stood in the beautiful United Nations cemetery on the outskirts of Pusan where the hills look down on the fields of silent graves. Some countries, such as the United States, have brought their dead home, while the men of other countries have found their last resting place in the land for whose freedom they have fought. Beneath the flag of the United Nations, beneath their own national flags and the flags of their comrades in arms flown

in honor of all the fallen, for me as an Australian it was especially impressive when visiting the graves of my own countrymen, and our kinsmen of the Commonwealth, to lift my eyes to the neighboring rows of Turkish graves and the other United Nations graves beyond.

Today in the headquarters of the United Nations we honor the memory of all these men and we share the grief of those who mourn them, whether here or in distant lands. The fallen belong to their own people but they belong also to us all. Their lives and their sacrifice were dedicated not only to their own countries but also to that wider loyalty which in time to come will unite all men and women into one peaceful family. We shall not forget them.

REMARKS BY AMBASSADOR HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. Secretary General, Mr. President, Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, the United States of America was the unified command during the fighting in Korea and it is accordingly my privilege to speak on behalf of the 16 member states who contributed troops: That is, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, the Union of South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America. With the men of the Republic of Korea, who carried such a large part of the load, these men carried on the fighting, sustained the losses, and won the victory.

The passage of time since these men died has made it all the clearer that this victory was worth winning. At stake was the very existence of the organization, the United Nations. At stake was the question of whether peace-loving nations could band themselves together to repel a ruthless and unprincipled aggression—or whether the doctrine that might makes right would triumph and, having triumphed in Korea, would then, without much doubt, spread to the rest of the world. Stated in the simplest terms, such was the issue.

The men whom we remember here today faced this issue. They proved their capacity to endure and to conquer. They won their war—and they preserved for us the chance to go forward. Their sacrifice reminds us that we do not measure man's life by its length but by its height. Indeed, the English poet Ben Jonson saw this long ago when he said:

"It is not growing like a tree,  
In bulk, doth make man better be;  
Or standing long an oak, three hundred year,  
To fall a log at last, dry, bald and sere:  
A lily of a day  
Is fairer far in May,  
Although it fall and die that night;  
It was the plant and flower of light.  
In small proportions we just beauties see;  
And in short measures life may perfect be."

For the future let the memories of our United Nations dead inspire us with the thought that the very existence of the United Nations must always depend on the willingness of the members to back up words by deeds—and in some cases by the blood of our sons.

It is fitting indeed that we here, in the presence of the highest ranking officials of the United Nations, should bow our heads in prayer, as we have just done, and that we should for these great ends dedicate this plaque.

#### DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR CARVILLE, OF NEVADA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, it is my sad duty to inform the Senate of the death several hours ago, in Reno, Nev., of

one of its former distinguished Members, the Honorable Edward Peter Carville.

Formerly a practicing attorney, United States district attorney, judge, Governor, and United States Senator, Edward Carville was indeed one of Nevada's most illustrious citizens.

He served his country and his State well in this Chamber from July 25, 1945, until January 3, 1947.

Born in the small community of Mound Valley, Nev., on May 14, 1885, Senator Carville attended the public elementary and high schools in Elko County, Nev. He was graduated from the University of Notre Dame in 1909.

After admission to the bar of Nevada, he practiced law in Elko, before becoming district attorney of Elko County in 1912. He served in that position until 1918.

He served as district judge of that county—one of the largest and richest counties in the United States—from 1928 to 1934. From 1934 to 1938 he was United States attorney for Nevada.

He was elected Governor of Nevada in 1938, and was reelected in 1942, following which he continued to serve as Governor until his resignation at the time when he was appointed to the United States Senate.

A father, a quiet man and a kindly soul, he accomplished much for his fellowmen in his years of public service. Senator Carville will long be remembered as a true son of Nevada, as has been recognized not only by the people of his State, but by his country as well.

The State of Nevada and the Nation have indeed suffered a great loss. I feel sure, Mr. President, that all the other Members of this body join me in expressing to the members of Senator Carville's family our deepest and most heartfelt sympathy.

#### DEATH OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE ELTON WATKINS, OF OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have the very sad duty, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER], of announcing to the Senate that the Honorable Elton Watkins, formerly a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Oregon, has passed away.

Elton Watkins was a prominent figure and an able leader in public life in the State of Oregon. He was educated at Washington and Lee University; held a bachelor of laws degree from Georgetown University Law School, and held a master of laws degree from George Washington Law School.

He is survived by his widow and his son, Dr. Elton Watkins, Jr., and by a daughter, Wilma Virginia Weber.

To his widow and his children, Mrs. Morse and I express our deepest sympathy in the great loss they have suffered, and we pray that there will be vouchsafed to them the spiritual strength to sustain them in the hour of their bereavement.

Mr. President, Elton Watkins, as a Member of the House of Representatives, was very active in sponsoring and supporting wise and important legislation.

He was a diligent worker for legislation designed for the benefit of veterans. He was very active in connection with the Soldier Bonus Act of 1924, and supported and worked ardently for the Immigration Act of 1925.

Mr. President, Mr. Elton was assistant United States attorney for Oregon in 1919; he was a Member of the United States House of Representatives, from the Third District of Oregon, from 1923 to 1925. He was instrumental in securing for Portland, Oreg., the present United States Veterans' Hospital. He was active in promoting the pay increase for postal employees.

During World War I, he was a member of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He was Democratic nominee for United States Senator from Oregon in 1930, and was a presidential elector in 1920, 1936, and 1944. He was a member of the Oregon and the Multnomah County Bar Associations, and made his home in Portland, Oreg.

I knew Mr. Watkins very well. He was always on the side of those who advocated and supported the general welfare of the people in connection with issue after issue in our State. I wish to express for the RECORD—and I know I speak for all the people of my State, including members of both parties—my feeling that in the passing of Elton Watkins, Oregon has lost an outstanding citizen and a valiant public servant. His monument is his record of public service.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the senior Senator from Oregon concerning the career of Elton Watkins.

Mr. Watkins was a neighbor of mine. His son, now a physician, had been a student at the high school where Mrs. Neuberger was a teacher. We knew the family well, and we were great admirers of Mr. Watkins' contribution to our State and Nation. His loss will be felt by our State for many years to come.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE LATE VICE ADMIRAL FRANCIS X. MCINERNEY, UNITED STATES NAVY, RETIRED

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to pay a brief tribute to a patriotic and heroic citizen of Wyoming, a vice admiral of the United States Navy, who unfortunately died suddenly on June 24 last at the Naval Hospital in San Diego, Calif.

I refer to Vice Adm. Francis Xavier McInerney, who, following his graduation from the Naval Academy in June 1920, continued actively in the service of the Navy until about 2 years ago.

During his career he won the Bronze Star, the Navy Cross, the Presidential Unit Citation, the Silver Star Medal, and the Legion of Merit.

He was the son of a pioneer family of the State of Wyoming. The McInerneys were loved and respected by all who knew them.

He was appointed to the Naval Academy from the city of Cheyenne, my own hometown. I very well remember the date of his selection by the late Senator Francis E. Warren.

He served with distinction, as the awards indicate; and the people of my State are universally distressed at his untimely death. I am sure they all wish to express deepest sympathy to the family he has left.

Vice Admiral McInerney was only 57 years of age. He was born in Cheyenne, Wyo., on March 28, 1899, the son of Thomas and Phyllis O'Neal McInerney.

He attended the University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo., for 1 year before his appointment to the United States Naval Academy from Wyoming in June 1917. Graduated and commissioned ensign with the class of 1921 (A) on June 4, 1920, he subsequently advanced to the rank of captain on June 20, 1942. His selection to rear admiral, approved by the President on November 21, 1947, was confirmed by the Senate on January 23, 1948, to date from September 1, 1947. On June 30, 1955, he was transferred to the retired list of the United States Navy, and was advanced to the rank of vice admiral on the basis of combat awards.

After graduation from the Naval Academy in June 1920, he served until June 1921 in the U. S. S. *New Mexico*, flagship of Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet. For 6 years thereafter he had duty in destroyers of the Pacific and Atlantic Fleets, including the U. S. S. *Burns*, U. S. S. *Williamson* and again in the U. S. S. *Burns*. From June 1927 to June 1929 he was assigned to the Naval Torpedo Station, Newport, R. I., after which he served for 3 years in the U. S. S. *Dobbin*.

In June 1932 he reported for postgraduate instruction in law, under the supervision of the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, at George Washington University Law School, Washington, D. C., and received the degree of bachelor of laws. He was admitted to practice in the District Court of the District of Columbia on November 20, 1935, and later in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Between June 1935 and June 1938 he served in the U. S. S. *Concord* in Pacific waters, after which he was an instructor at the Postgraduate School, Annapolis, Md.

He assumed command of the U. S. S. *Smith* in May 1940, and was commanding that destroyer when the United States entered World War II on December 8, 1941. In February 1942, while in command of a destroyer division, he became the senior officer in destroyers attached to the ANZAC Squadron in the South Pacific, and as such participated in the early strikes in the Solomons and the Battle of the Coral Sea. He received a Letter of Commendation, with Ribbon, from the Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet, for "exemplary action on May 7, 1942, while in command of three destroyers attached to a task group when this group was attacked by enemy torpedo planes followed by enemy bombing planes, repelling the enemy attack without damage to our own forces and with the enemy loss of several planes."

In March 1943 he assumed command of Destroyer Squadron 21, first of the new 2,100-ton destroyers. These ships, under his command, operated in the

Solomons in the First and Second Battles of Kula Gulf, and rescued survivors of the U. S. S. *Helena*.

As I have already said, he was awarded the Bronze Star Medal with Combat "V," the Navy Cross, Presidential Unit Citation and Ribbon, the Silver Star Medal, and the Legion of Merit with Combat "V." Extracts from the citations read as follows:

#### Bronze Star Medal:

For meritorious achievement as commander of Destroyer Squadron 21 operating as a component of a task force during combined minelaying and bombardment missions in the enemy Japanese-held Kolombangara and New Georgia areas, Solomon Islands, on the night of May 13, 1943.

#### Navy Cross:

For extraordinary heroism as commanding officer of a squadron of destroyers in action against enemy Japanese forces in the Solomon Islands on July 5-6, 1943. As part of a task force in close support of the landing of United States troops at Rice Anchorage on New Georgia Island (he) skillfully led his group of destroyers through restricted submarine infested waters and effectively bombarded enemy shore batteries and installations in the face of intense hostile gun and torpedo fire \* \* \* succeeded in sinking or severely damaging all of the hostile vessels.

#### Presidential Unit Citation, U. S. S. *Nicholas*:

For outstanding performance in action against enemy Japanese forces off Kolombangara Island, New Georgia Group, Solomon Islands, on the night of July 5-6, 1943. After waging a vigorous battle as part of the small task force which destroyed a superior Japanese surface force, the *Nicholas* remained behind with an accompanying destroyer to save survivors of the torpedoed U. S. S. *Helena*. \* \* \* With the other destroyer (she) sank or damaged an enemy light cruiser and 2 destroyers with deadly torpedo and gunfire, returning to the area after each onslaught to complete the heroic rescue of more than 700 survivors.

#### Silver Star Medal:

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action as commander of a task group of destroyers during the engagement with enemy Japanese forces off Kolombangara Island, Solomon Islands, in the early morning of July 13, 1943.

#### Legion of Merit:

For exceptionally meritorious conduct \* \* \* as commander of a naval task unit of destroyers which covered the operations of other naval units engaged in the rescue of about 165 survivors of the sunken U. S. S. *Helena* who had reached shore on the enemy-occupied island of Vella Lavella, New Georgia Island, on July 15-16, 1943. Skillfully conducting his unit during the night from Guadalcanal through the "slot" to the northward of Vella Lavella to appropriate positions (he) deliberately risked observation and attack by hostile aircraft and possible attack by superior enemy naval forces based nearby at Shortland Islands, to permit the rescue of the survivors of the *Helena*. By his strategic ability, and sound judgment, he was responsible for the successful completion of the operations of the covering and rescue units and the return through the "slot" on the morning of July 16, without damage to his forces.

In August 1943 he became representative of commander destroyers in the South Pacific and in March 1944 was named Chief of Staff for Commander

Operational Training Command, Pacific Fleet. For his services in this capacity he received a letter of commendation from the Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet, and wears a bronze star on his commendation ribbon.

He assumed command of the battleship *Washington* on June 5, 1945, at San Pedro Bay, Leyte, P. I. Under his command the U. S. S. *Washington* returned to the United States in the summer of 1945 to join the Atlantic Fleet. After participation in Navy Day—1945—ceremonies at Philadelphia, Pa., she was assigned troop-transport duty, and in November of that year became part of the "magic carpet" fleet. On her last voyage bringing veterans to their homeland, she encountered a series of severe hurricanes.

In October 1946 he reported as commanding officer of the Naval Receiving Station, Naval Station, Treasure Island, San Francisco, Calif., and on February 5, 1948, was ordered to command Cruiser Division 15. He assumed command of Cruiser Division 3, March 11, 1949, and on July 17, 1949, was transferred to command of Cruiser Division 5. He remained in that assignment until September 1949 when he was ordered to report to the Commander Battleships-Cruisers Pacific Fleet, for further assignment.

In January 1950 he became Commander Amphibious Training Command, Pacific Fleet. On September 24, 1951, he assumed command of Amphibious Group 3, Pacific Fleet, and in November 1952 transferred to command of Service Squadron 3.

For meritorious service as Commander Joint Amphibious Task Force 7 and Commander Task Force 76, from 14 to 16 October 1953, and as Commander Task Force 92 from 21 November 1952 to 13 February 1953, during operations against enemy aggressor forces in Korea—

He was awarded a Gold Star in lieu of the Second Bronze Star Medal with Combat "V." The citation continues in part:

As Commander Joint Amphibious Task Force 7, Rear Admiral McInerney conducted a highly successful amphibious training exercise along the enemy-held beach at Kojo, Korea, without sustaining a single casualty. This operation was of exceptional planning value to the prosecution of the Korean conflict. As Commander Task Force 92, he was charged with the responsibility of providing logistic support to combatant units in Korean waters. Through the development of a technique of underway replenishment, he was instrumental in helping the 7th Fleet to maintain almost continual pressure on the enemy in Korea, reducing to a minimum the necessity for trips into port for upkeep and replenishment. Under his direction, the ships of his force established numerous records in the field of logistics. By his outstanding professional skill, sound judgment, and steadfast devotion to duty, (he) contributed materially to the success of the naval effort in the Korean conflict.

Ordered detached from command of Service Squadron 3, he reported in March 1953 as senior member, Board of Naval Inspection and Survey, West Coast Section, with headquarters in San Francisco, Calif. In October 1954 he became president of the Permanent General Court

Martial, 11th Naval District, with headquarters in San Diego, Calif., continuing to serve in that capacity until relieved of all active duty, pending his retirement effective June 30, 1955.

In addition to the Navy Cross, the Silver Star Medal, the Legion of Merit with Combat V, Bronze Star Medal with Gold Star and Combat V, the commendation ribbon with bronze star, and the Presidential Unit Citation ribbon, Vice Admiral McInerney has the World War I Victory Medal, Atlantic Fleet Clasp; the American Defense Service Medal, Fleet Clasp; the American Campaign Medal; the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with three engagement stars; World War II Victory Medal; the Navy Occupation Service Medal; the China Service Medal; National Defense Service Medal; Korean Service Medal; and the United Nations Service Medal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

#### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D. C., June 27, 1956.

Desiring to be temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR., a Senator from the State of Delaware, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. FREAR thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

#### CLAIMS OF VATICAN CITY FOR LOSSES CAUSED BY THE ARMED FORCES DURING WORLD WAR II

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2315, H. R. 10766.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10766) to authorize the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Montana to make a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the sum of \$964,199.35 in full and final settlement of all claims of the Vatican City for losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces in the Papal Domain Castel Gandolfo during World War II. The same amount is authorized to be appropriated for that purpose.

Castel Gandolfo was accidentally damaged on February 2, 10, May 31, and June 4, 1944, by bombs dropped from United States planes in raids on nearby military targets.

This amount has been approved by the Defense Establishment and by the State Department, and the bill has already been passed by the House. I urge that it be passed by the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate, and is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 10766) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill (H. R. 10766) to authorize the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II was passed. I have consulted the minority leader, and he is agreeable to such action.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Rhode Island to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote by which House bill 10766 was passed.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 523, 78th Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. LANKFORD of Maryland, and Mr. KEARNS of Pennsylvania, to serve as members of the National Memorial Stadium Commission, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10003) making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7 and 16 to the bill, and concurred therein.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, and 18 to the bill, and concurred therein.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 3149) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to permit air carriers to grant free or reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CARLYLE, Mr. MACK of Illinois, Mr. WOLVERTON, and Mr. HINSHAW were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAHON, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. SIKES, Mr. NORRELL, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. RILEY, Mr. DEANE, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. CANNON, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. SCRIVNER, Mr. FORD, Mr. MILLER of Maryland, Mr. OSTERTAG, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 11926) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, to permit the negotiation of commercial leases at atomic energy communities, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 2512. An act to amend the act of August 27, 1954, so as to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of certain mem-

bers of the Armed Forces who died or were killed while serving in such forces;

H. R. 6782. An act to amend section 7 of "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 7621. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10660. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 11926) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, to permit the negotiation of commercial leases at atomic energy communities, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

#### OPPOSITION TO DISCRIMINATORY ACTION AGAINST CITIZENS BECAUSE OF RELIGION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I submit for appropriate reference, a resolution opposing discriminatory action against United States citizens because of religious faith or affiliations.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution lie at the desk for 2 legislative days, so that other Members of the Senate who may wish to join in sponsoring the resolution may have an opportunity to do so.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New York; and, under the rule, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 298) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the protection of the integrity of United States citizenship and of the proper rights of United States citizens in their pursuit of lawful trade, travel, and other activities abroad is a cardinal function of United States sovereignty; and

Whereas it is a primary principle of our Nation that there shall be no distinction among United States citizens based on their individual religious affiliations and since any attempt by foreign nations to create such distinctions among our citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights otherwise available to United States citizens generally is repugnant to our laws and intolerable to our principles—an attitude which our Government has historically and successfully maintained in our relations with foreign countries on several notable occasions; and

Whereas recently certain United States servicemen, solely because of their religious

faith, affiliation or even derivation have been denied assignments to certain United States military bases abroad and these and other United States citizens have been refused entry and travel visas by the governments of certain foreign countries, which governments have also directed and organized a trade and economic boycott against American citizens and classes of American citizens based solely on the religious faith, affiliation or religious derivation of such citizens: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that (a) the President of the United States should proclaim to all nations that the Government of the United States tolerates no distinction based on religious faith among its own citizens just as it makes none among the citizens and subjects of any other country and that it regards any such distinctions directed against United States citizens as incompatible with the relations that should exist among friendly nations; and (b) no agency of the United States shall refrain from assigning any otherwise qualified American citizen to military, diplomatic or other service within any foreign country solely because of that country's objection on grounds of religious affiliation to any American or class of Americans; and (c) every treaty, convention, or executive agreement entered into or renewed between any foreign state and the United States should expressly provide that no United States citizens shall, solely because of religious affiliation or derivation, be denied the advantages of travel, employment or trade or any other benefit made possible by such treaty, convention or agreement.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the resolution declares the sense of the Senate with regard to certain concepts of American citizenship, and with regard to the intolerable practices of certain foreign governments against some of our citizens, and distinctions being made among them, on the basis of their religious faith, all without protest by our own Government.

Mr. President, what I am about to say about this resolution reflects only my own views and observations. I do not purport to speak for other cosponsors of the resolution.

I wish to emphasize that my motive in bringing the resolution before the Senate and the country at this time is not partisan or political. I am, indeed, critical of the Department of State and of the Department of Defense for their acquiescences in the practices complained of. But I make this criticism without regard to partisanship and without any thought of political advantage. This is a matter which is of concern to all Americans, regardless of party. It involves the standing and prestige of our Nation abroad.

It may be that some of the practices with which the resolution deals were in existence before the Eisenhower administration took office and were also sanctioned by the previous administration. I do not know. I do not have any evidence that this is so. All the evidence I have received dates back only a year or so. And I have been agitating this matter since the first day that these practices came to my attention.

The reason why I am bringing this matter before the Senate at this time is that an agreement with Saudi Arabia covering the use of base facilities in

that country is now being renegotiated. I feel it essential that the views of the Senate on this subject be conveyed to the State and Defense Departments while they are currently engaged in renegotiating the agreement with the Government of Saudi Arabia.

One of the oldest traditions of international law is the duty and function of every country to safeguard the proper and lawful interests of its nationals and citizens abroad. This includes, on the part of each sovereign nation, the duty to protect the life and liberty of its citizens while they are properly and legally traveling through or residing in foreign countries. Clearly implied is the duty of each sovereign nation to protect and defend the integrity of the citizenship status of its citizens in their business, travels, or residence abroad.

No country has recognized this function more clearly in past years than has the United States of America. We have always maintained, in the most vigorous and forceful manner possible, that American citizenship affords to every citizen the protection of his Government in all legitimate pursuits, activities, and travels abroad. We have always taken the position, as a nation, that the might and power of the United States accompanies each American citizen in all his legal and proper activities and travels abroad.

Above all, our Government has always maintained that it was not the concern or the right of any foreign government to make any distinctions, as among American citizens, in any way, shape, or manner. Thus, one of the underlying causes of the War of 1812 with Great Britain was the British insistence on seizing American naturalized citizens, former British subjects, and impressing them into the British military service. We fought a long and difficult war with Great Britain on this and related points. Our very National Capital was attacked and seized—and this very Capitol Building and the White House were burned—by British forces in the course of that war. We won our point. The doctrine of the freedom of the seas was established, and the doctrine of the integrity of American citizenship was authoritatively established.

Indeed, there is a statute on our books, enacted on July 27, 1868, requiring the President of the United States and the Department of State to take immediate action whenever the rights of any American citizen are violated or threatened by a foreign state.

This right, Mr. President, does not extend to just some American citizens. It extends to all American citizens. In this law no distinction is made between citizens of one religious faith and citizens of another, between citizens of one national origin and citizens of another. Indeed, this right was specifically defined by a former Secretary of State of the United States, Louis Cass, when he said that the object of our foreign policy is—

Not merely to protect a Protestant in a Catholic country, a Catholic in a Protestant country, and a Jew in a Christian country, but an American in all countries.

This, Mr. President, is one of the very cornerstones of American foreign policy. This was originally one of the most important and one of the most basic functions in the conduct of American foreign policy, as it is one of the basic functions in the conduct of all foreign policy by all countries in the world.

But what is going on today, so far as the United States is concerned?

Our country is today the leader of the free world, allegedly at the zenith of our world power and influence. Yet where do we stand today with regard to the traditional doctrine of the integrity of American citizenship? How valiantly does our Government uphold that doctrine?

The truth is that we have virtually abandoned and discarded it. Today, we tolerate on the part of other countries practices which we would never have tolerated in an earlier day, when we were much less of a power in world affairs.

I refer specifically, Mr. President, to the practices of some Arab countries with regard to American citizens, and, more specifically, to the policies of the Government of Saudi Arabia.

How does the Government of Saudi Arabia treat American citizens? Let me enumerate some of the affronts which we suffer today without official complaint, remonstrance, or protest.

The Saudi Arabian Government has made it a practice to refuse both entry and transit privileges to any American citizen of Jewish faith or of Jewish descent. American citizens of such faith and descent on board planes which are forced, by emergency, to land in Saudi Arabian airports—and airports of some other Arab countries, as well—are treated like pariahs or lepers, and are denied even the basic courtesies of temporary emergency hospitality.

These Americans are frequently locked up until their plane takes off again, or are forbidden to leave the plane at all.

The Saudi Arabian Government has decreed and enforced a boycott against American firms and corporations in which Americans of Jewish faith have an interest. Questionnaires are circulated to all American firms doing business with Saudi Arabia, asking the impertinent question and sometimes impossible to answer, as to whether any Jews are associated with the firm.

Finally—and most insupportable of all—the Saudi Arabian Government, having granted to the United States the right to construct an airbase in Saudi Arabia, presumes to tell us that we must not station on this base or allow to land on this base any American soldier or other individual who is of Jewish faith or descent.

Americans of Jewish faith and descent, including GI's, are restrained by our Government from boarding any plane, military or otherwise, which is scheduled to land, even in transit, at the airports of most Arab countries.

Our Government accepts the boycott against certain American firms on the incredible basis that so-called Jewish interests are involved in these firms.

Finally, our State Department studiously refrains from sending to the American base in Saudi Arabia any American soldier who is of Jewish faith or descent.

Recently Secretary of State Dulles, in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, called the practices of the Saudi Arabia Government to which I have referred, an "eccentricity," a mannerism or characteristic rather odd and unusual, but surely to be politely and graciously accepted in all tolerance and affability.

Mr. President, I do not consider this an eccentricity of manner or character. I consider this a violent attack upon the whole concept of American citizenship. I consider the basic attitude of the United States Government in this matter to be reprehensible and insupportable.

Mr. President, I have spoken out on this matter before. I have written letters to the State Department and the Defense Department. I have made protests. I have made speeches on the floor of the Senate. They have been to no avail. The State Department and the Defense Department have replied politely that they do not approve of these practices on the part of the Saudi Arabian Government, but have shown no disposition to do anything other than to say to me, "That's too bad."

After all, it would not do to speak out loud and clear. The Government of Saudi Arabia might take offense. Today we seem to stand in awesome respect of this Government, the most feudalistic and totalitarian in the world, which has given us airbase rights and does have deposits and reserves of oil.

Mr. President, I believe that military and security considerations are very important. I believe in military preparedness. I believe in a posture of military as well as economic strength in the present world situation. I believe that our present system of off-shore bases is an integral part of our security. I believe that we must look after our supplies of oil, both at home and abroad, for the sake of the security not only of ourselves, but of our friends and allies throughout the free world. I believe that our Government should do all that is necessary and proper to protect and advance these vital considerations.

But, Mr. President, I do not believe that these are the only considerations to guide our foreign policy. I think—and I believe the country thinks—that it not only fails to help, but it actually hurts our national security and our position in world affairs if we do not stand up for our traditional principles, if we do not practice abroad what we preach at home—in short, if we do not adhere to high principles in the conduct of our foreign policy.

I think we lose the respect of friend and foe alike if we make expediency our guide; if we wink at violations of our high principles in the name of practical considerations; if we compromise with principle in order to gain some fancied military advantage.

In specific regard to the policies pursued by Saudi Arabia in which we appear, in the eyes of the world, to acqui-

esce, I think we lose the respect of Saudi Arabia and of every other government in the world when we seem so eager to have a base in Saudi Arabia and to enjoy the favor and good will of the Saudi Arabian Government and of other Arab governments, that we neglect our traditional principles and tolerate practices which are repugnant both to the national conscience and to our national traditions.

I believe that the Government of Saudi Arabia will respect us more if we stand up for our principles and refuse to accommodate ourselves to the intolerable prejudices of the Saudi Arabian Government in the name of either oil or base rights.

The free world needs Saudi Arabian oil and the security interests of the free world are, I assume, advanced by the maintenance of an American airbase in Saudi Arabia. But that is a two-way street. Saudi Arabia needs the revenue from that oil—the dollar revenue—and Saudi Arabia enjoys the security which the presence of an American airbase within that country affords.

We must, I believe, deal with Saudi Arabia as with an equal, not as if we were a weakling nation seeking favors.

Mr. President, as I have suggested, we have not always been as craven in our relationships with other countries as we seem to be today with Saudi Arabia. I believe that the spirit of the great American naval hero, Stephen Decatur, must gaze unbelievably down at us today, as he sees the tiny republic now grown great in whose interests he fought in the Mediterranean against the might and power of the Ottoman Empire more than a century ago, endure, without protest, at the hands of Saudi Arabia, an economic boycott directed against some Americans and a ban against the admission of some Americans to an American airbase in Saudi Arabia.

Less than 75 years ago, Mr. President, the President of the United States appointed a gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Anthony M. Keiley, to be the American Minister to the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The United States Government was then officially informed by the Austro-Hungarian Government that this gentleman from Virginia could not be accredited and was unacceptable in Vienna because of the fact that he was married to a lady of the Jewish faith.

What was the reaction of the United States Government at that time? Did we accept this declaration of *persona non grata* by the Austro-Hungarian Government on the basis of the religious faith of the wife of the individual whom we had designated to represent us at Vienna? No, we did not. We had a Secretary of State at that time, a Mr. Bayard, who replied, in a note to the Austro-Hungarian Government, in language which could well be used today:

It is not within the power of the President, nor the Congress, nor of any judicial tribunal in the United States to take or even hear testimony, in any mode, to inquire into or decide upon the religious belief of any official, and the proposition to allow this to be done by any foreign government is necessarily and a fortiori inadmissible.

To suffer an infraction of this essential principle would lead to a disfranchisement of our citizens because of their religious belief, and thus impair or destroy the most important end which our constitution of government was intended to secure.

Mr. President, on that occasion the United States Government refused to accept the grounds for rejection of Mr. Keiley, of Virginia, and even though Mr. Keiley asked to have his name withdrawn, the United States Government, for a long time thereafter, declined to appoint a minister to the Government of Austro-Hungary, then one of the most powerful nations in the world.

Mr. President, there is an even more recent, and even more appropriate precedent—a precedent so similar that it is uncanny. I refer to the controversy between our Government and the Government of Czarist Russia in regard to the refusal of Russia to permit Americans of Jewish faith to enter or travel through Russia.

That was in the first decade of the present century. Czarist Russia was engaging at that time in large-scale repression against Jews. Pogroms were common. These outrages were, of course, directed against Russian Jews. But then the Government of Czarist Russia took it upon itself to decline to honor passports issued by the United States Government to American citizens, if those American citizens happened to be of the Jewish faith.

It happens that the American Minister to Russia at that time was a Mr. John W. Foster who was, in fact, the grandfather of the present Secretary of State of the United States. Mr. Foster, who was later himself to become Secretary of State, did not view the actions of the Czarist Government in the same light as that in which his grandson views the activities of the Saudi Arabian Government. He did not view this as an "eccentricity" on the part of the Czarist regime.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wish to compliment the Senator from New York on his very fine speech dealing with the failure of the State Department to insist on permission to travel and permission of entry in certain countries. The Senator is referring to the same Secretary of State, a descendant of a very courageous Secretary of State, who will not even issue a passport for a United States Senator who wishes to travel to Israel if he intends first to visit an Arab country.

It would seem to me that the United States Government is cowardly indeed when, because of the fear of offending the military dictator of Egypt, or the complete and absolute monarch of Saudi Arabia, or the dictator of any of the other Arab countries, it will not issue a passport to a United States Senator who intends to visit Israel, but who first expects to enter an Arab country.

Certainly I wish that at some time or other someone in the State Department would have a little courage to issue a passport and to have an Israeli visa affixed to it, and then to let the Arab

countries decide whether they will deny entry to a United States Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives or even the head of a Government agency because the passport carries an Israeli visa.

I know of no time when the United States of America seems to have been so intimidated by the fear that we might incur the displeasure of men who, because of great oil interests, can dictate the policies not only of Jews, but of Members of the United States Congress who seek to obtain information regarding the lack of policy and the continued efforts to appease those who today govern Arab countries.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his statement, which I find very enlightening and interesting. I have heard that even Members of Congress and other high officials were denied passports unless they first gave assurance that they would not visit other countries before or after visiting Israel. That has not happened to me personally but I have no doubt that it may have happened to other Members of the Congress. I am not so much concerned by the effect of this policy on myself, a Jew and Member of the Senate, as I am about what has happened to our concept of democracy and equality, when we say to a Jewish soldier, "You cannot serve in any of the world in which your Government has vital interests, because of your religious faith."

To me that is an intolerable situation. It is intolerable to me to say to an American soldier who runs exactly the same risks as any other American serviceman, and who has exactly the same devotion and exactly the same love of country and of the traditions of our Nation, "You are going to be treated as a second-class citizen because of your religious faith. You are not going to be permitted to serve your country."

In 1654 the first Jews came to this country from Brazil. That was more than 300 years ago. One of the first things this little group of Jews demanded was not a special privilege, but the right to bear arms with their fellow citizens and with them to defend their country. They insisted on the right to fight for their country and to serve their country in exactly the same way, to the same degree, and in the same circumstances as other citizens.

Yet, our Government repudiates what has been the history and the tradition of our Nation ever since it was founded 180 years ago. Even after we have become a great power, the greatest in the world today, we are willing to stand idly by and supinely accept affronts and insults on the part of other countries. We are not willing to stand up for our long-cherished principles of treating all our citizens with exact equality and of expecting all our citizens to do their duty in exactly the same degree and manner.

Mr. President, Mr. Foster, who was then Minister to Russia, undertook an exchange of correspondence with his own Government and with the Government of Czarist Russia, protesting strongly against these practices of the Czarist regime.

Nor was the State Department the only agency of the Government to take note of this situation. The President of the United States spoke out on the matter. On December 4, 1911, there was introduced into the House of Representatives by Representative William Sulzer, of New York, a joint resolution calling upon the President of the United States to terminate, at the earliest possible time, the treaty of commerce and friendship with the Government of Russia on the grounds of the discriminations practiced against American Jews.

This resolution was passed by the House of Representatives. It was passed by the United States Senate. And, in fact, in 1913 the United States did terminate, on these grounds, its treaty of commerce and friendship with Czarist Russia.

Mr. President, we had vital interests in Russia in those days. We obtained considerable amounts of strategic minerals and other material from Russia. There was a profitable trade in furs and foodstuffs. There were vital diplomatic interests at stake, too. The world was forming into two armed camps. The interests of the United States lay pretty clearly with England and France, which were, in turn, allied with Russia. But did we let this stand in our way? No; we broke off our commercial treaty with Czarist Russia because of the principle involved.

Mr. President, we do not have a treaty of commerce and friendship with Saudi Arabia, but we do have a base agreement with that Government. That base agreement has run its course and has expired. It is in the process of renegotiation. I believe, Mr. President, that in any new agreement—and I hope there will be one—there should be a clause which protects the sanctity and integrity of American citizenship and puts an immediate end to the unseemly and undignified acquiescence on the part of the United States Government to the prejudicial, discriminatory, and intolerable attitude of the Saudi Arabian Government toward Americans of Jewish faith.

Certainly we should not allow the Saudi Arabian Government to tell us which American soldiers we can admit to an American airbase and which American soldiers can land on a base which flies the American flag.

Mr. President, a great many individuals and organizations in this country have expressed their deepest concern over the situation I have described, and have petitioned me, and other Members of the Senate, to take such action as we properly can in this matter. One of these organizations is the American Jewish Congress. The American Jewish Congress has, over the past year, undertaken a comprehensive study of this situation—of the practices of the Saudi Arabian Government and of the precedents of the past in similar situations. It has shown intense concern, and has been very active in gathering information and background material on this subject.

Very recently the American Jewish Congress published what it called a white paper entitled "The Arab Campaign

Against American Jews." This document contains a great deal of very useful and illuminating material of a factual nature, as well as an expression of the viewpoint of the American Jewish Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the white paper issued by the American Jewish Congress under the title I have already cited be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I think it contains material which should be available to every Member of the Senate in considering the resolution we have introduced today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the American Jewish Committee, to which I have just referred, has also done a comprehensive and constructive job of collecting factual material and of assessing the situation. This organization has published a document entitled "The Assault on American Citizenship," a title which very appropriately describes the evils which the resolution I have submitted is designed to remedy. I should like to put this document also into the RECORD, but I understand that the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] intends to do so.

Mr. President, I assume that the resolution which we have submitted today will be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee. I hope the resolution will be speedily considered and favorably reported by the committee, and I pray that the Senate will promptly act upon it; that the sense of the Senate will so impress the Secretary of State and the United States Government that appropriate action will be taken in the days ahead.

#### EXHIBIT 1

#### THE ARAB CAMPAIGN AGAINST AMERICAN JEWS—A STATEMENT OF THE FACTS AND A CONSIDERATION OF AMERICA'S MORAL AND DIPLOMATIC RESPONSIBILITY

#### FOREWORD

One of the least known byproducts of current Arab-Israeli hostility is the widespread campaign by Arab League countries against Jews in the United States. Internal anti-Jewish campaigns indulged in by Arab States at the expense of their own subjects may be a matter for their sovereign discretion and even then may contravene commitments undertaken pursuant to the United Nations Charter. But efforts to package and export anti-Semitism to this country, especially when that anti-Jewish sentiment is directed at American citizens, becomes a matter demanding immediate remedial action by our own Government.

The principal forms of discrimination currently employed by the Arab States against American Jews may be classified into three categories: (1) Arab denial of entry or transit visas to American Jews; (2) Arab boycott of American Jewish businesses; (3) the establishment and subvention of large-scale Arab propaganda centers to disseminate anti-Semitic literature in the United States. Each of these is discussed in detail at a later point in this paper.

Some of these anti-Jewish discriminatory practices have been continued over a period of years without occasioning more than gentle rebuke from any agency of the United States. Whatever expressions of disapproval have recently been made by our State Department have tended to be perfunctory and

short lived, limited to the writing of notes and the routine exchange of correspondence. Not once in recent years has this country ventured beyond mild protest into any form of action.

Encouraged by this seeming official casualness, if not indifference, the Arab States continue to act virtually as they please in the mistreatment of American Jews, perfectly confident that our Government will not uphold the rights of its Jewish citizens. The apathy and apparent indifference of our Government has served not only to intensify Arab hostility to Jews within their own territories but to increase and introduce anti-Semitism in new and unexpected quarters here.

The most recent illustration of State Department thinking on these issues may be found in the testimony of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 24, 1956. Those portions of Mr. Dulles' statement that are relevant to matters discussed in this memorandum are contained in the following colloquy with Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota:

"Senator HUMPHREY. Speaking of Americans who are in Saudi Arabia, is it true what I read in the paper here, and which I spoke about in the Senate, and which today the Pentagon apparently seems to feel is true, but I want to get all departments in on it, to the effect that arrangements have been arrived at between our Government and Saudi Arabia under the terms of the Mutual Security Agreement and our air base at Dhahran, that certain American personnel are not permitted to be stationed in Saudi Arabia, American personnel of the Jewish faith?"

"Secretary DULLES. It may be. I think that for many years, not just in recent years, but that running over a long period of years, there has been a prohibition on Jews in Saudi Arabia.

"Senator HUMPHREY. I mean Americans; I am talking about citizens of the United States of America.

"Secretary DULLES. I am talking about persons of Jewish faith.

"Senator HUMPHREY. Yes; but Americans.

"Secretary DULLES. Yes, of any nationality.

"Senator HUMPHREY. Is it true that American businessmen who may be of the Jewish faith are not permitted to engage in commercial enterprise in Saudi Arabia with our agreement and our recognition of that discrimination?"

"Secretary DULLES. No, not with our agreement or recognition of it. The King of Saudi Arabia regards himself as the primary custodian of the sacred places of the Moslem faith, and they have a long time been extremely rigorous in the practice of the Moslem law.

"I was there—when I was there visiting King Ibn Saud, it was during the period of the Ramadan, where from the very time the sun rises in the morning—and at that time of the year it rises very early—until it sets at night, no one can take a drop of liquid or a bite of food, and the former King Ibn Saud was an aging feeble man, but he nevertheless stuck rigorously to that, and there is another prohibition that applies there also. There is not a drop of liquor that is allowed to be sold or used in the whole area.

"Now, they have got some practices which we may think curious.

"Now, we do not like or approve of or acquiesce, except perforce in any such practices, such as that, but we do have to recognize the fact that Saudi Arabia is an ally, became an ally in the first instance, through the conversations and subsequent communications with President Roosevelt, and then it was confirmed by President Truman, and we have a very special relationship there with that Government.

"That does not mean we approve of all its practices at all. It does mean we get

along together in a way which is of mutual advantage.

"We, perforce, accommodate ourselves to certain practices they have which we do not like; they, perhaps, accommodate themselves to certain of our idiosyncrasies which they do not like, but on the whole, they have a pretty arbitrary rule, largely dictated by the strict tenets of the Moslem faith."

The American Jewish Congress is an organization of American Jews whose membership is generally sympathetic to Israel. But our concern over the serious errors in national policy and diplomatic judgment discussed in this paper does not derive from either of these factors. The injury and affront we discuss here is sustained by all Americans who are currently made witness to arrogant Arab violation and disregard of the rights of American citizenship. We respectfully submit that the time is past due for our diplomatic representatives to resist such encroachments upon American rights with firmness and dignity.

We are not unmindful that much is at stake. American officials in high places have made it their business to emphasize frequently that the present unusual solicitude in dealing with Arab governments is designed to protect military and economic relations presumed to be vital to our material interests. We are told repeatedly that important commercial and industrial undertakings remain possible only because of American willingness to compromise and to accommodate Arab prejudice. We are warned that substantial American interests will be put in jeopardy if Arab-American relations are, in any way, strained or impaired. It is even intimated that we must concede something, even at the expense of a certain number of our citizens, in order not to risk this economic stake.

We submit that this view is a perversion of traditional and basic American doctrine. It reflects a way of thinking that accepts the subordination of the rights of citizenship to the expediencies of international bargaining and that regards the legal incidents of citizenship as expendable items to be traded away. We cannot refrain from adding, though we do not believe this paper to be the appropriate occasion to argue this point at length, that it is doubly deplorable that this position should be urged to support a course of conduct that is not only morally wrong but badly calculated in terms of national advantage. We are convinced that a realistic appraisal of the economic potential of the Middle East will disclose that no legitimate American interest is in real danger from Arab rulers who, however fanatic their religious hatreds, nevertheless remain hard-headed businessmen whose economic advancement is wholly dependent upon American investment dollars.

Issues of precisely this character are not without precedent for the United States. The diplomatic history of any great nation is the record of its capacity to sustain, or its willingness to abandon, those ideals that embody its national creed. When confronted with a threat to the liberties of its citizens, indeed, when forced to choose between condoning exactly the kind of anti-Semitism now practiced by the Arab States and risking the possibility of economic loss, this country did not in the past waiver or equivocate. For us the claim of freedom has always been of greater force and dignity than the claim of profit.

When Woodrow Wilson was advised in 1911 (as we are now advised respecting the Arab States), that there must not be American diplomatic intercession against foreign anti-Semitism because of possible danger to American investment opportunities, he stated:

"There lies a principle back of our life. America is not a mere body of traders; it is

a body of free men. Our greatness is built upon our freedom—is moral, not material. We have a great ardor for gain; but we have a deep passion for the rights of man. Principles lie back of our action. America would be inconceivable without them. These principles are not incompatible with great material prosperity. On the contrary, unless we are deeply mistaken, they are indispensable to it. We are not willing to have prosperity, however, if our fellow citizens must suffer contempt for it, or lose the rights that belong to every American in order that we may enjoy it. The price is too great." (48 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 497-498 (62d Cong., 2d sess., Dec. 6, 1911).)

Before turning to a detailed examination of Arab anti-Semitism in the United States, we believe it pertinent, therefore, to consider briefly past actions taken by this country in protest of foreign anti-Semitic excesses.

#### I. AMERICAN DIPLOMATIC PRECEDENTS

American diplomats have never been diffident in denouncing religious discrimination against any American nationals who travel abroad. Under the act of July 27, 1868 (15 Stat. 244) the President of the United States and the Department of State are required to take immediate action whenever the rights of any American citizen are violated or threatened by a foreign state. This right of protection admits of no religious limitation. As stated by Secretary of State Lewis Cass, the object of our foreign policy is "not merely to protect a Catholic in a Protestant country, a Protestant in a Catholic country, a Jew in a Christian country, but an American in all countries." (Quoted in J. B. Moore, *American Diplomacy* (1905), at p. 135.)

This diplomatic principle derives from the recognition by those charged with determining and administering our foreign policy that the defense of religious liberty is an inseparable aspect of all American undertakings. In a diplomatic note protesting Austro-Hungarian anti-Semitism directed at the family of an American Minister-designate, Secretary of State Thomas F. Bayard declared, in 1885:

"Religious liberty is the chief cornerstone of the American system of government, and provisions for its security are imbedded in the written charter and interwoven in the moral fabric of its laws.

"Anything that tends to invade a right so essential and sacred must be carefully guarded against, and I am satisfied that my countrymen, ever mindful of the sufferings and sacrifices necessary to obtain it, will never consent to its impairment for any reason or under any pretext whatsoever.

"It is not believed by the President that a doctrine and practice so destructive of religious liberty and freedom of conscience, so devoid of catholicity, and so opposed to the spirit of the age in which we live, can for a moment be accepted by the great family of civilized nations or be allowed to control their diplomatic intercourse.

"Certain it is, it will never, in my belief, be accepted by the people of the United States nor by any administration which represents their sentiments" (*Foreign Relations* (1885), p. 50).

#### A. Czarist Russia

Perhaps the most noteworthy of all of the interpositions by our Government to protect the rights of Jewish communities from the force and effect of foreign anti-Semitic decrees—if only because it is virtually on all fours, both in the character of the anti-Semitic discrimination and in its attempted rationale, with the discrimination currently practiced by the Arab governments—was that made over a period of years in protest against Czarist Russia's expulsion and exclusion of American citizens of Jewish faith. This intercession with Russia is significant not only because it unequivocally

fixed and defined American policy on this issue but also because it reflected the ardor with which American spokesmen insisted upon adherence to principle, even at the risk of commercial disadvantage, and in the enthusiasm and unanimity with which the people of this country endorsed that stand. We submit that neither the State Department nor the general community now should be content with any less zealous protection of fundamental rights.

In the 19th century, Russian anti-Semitism, like Arab anti-Semitism today, was intense and deeply rooted. The history of the Jews in Russia was a catalog of savage and bloody assaults upon them, attacks that were endorsed, either openly or tacitly, by the Russian Government itself. In addition, the Czar had promulgated a network of anti-Jewish legislation directed nominally at his own Jewish subjects but applied without distinction to Jews of any nationality who found themselves within Russian borders. Among these restrictions were rules forbidding the free entry, travel, or residence of Jews in certain parts of the country outside the pale of settlement. As a result American Jews who dared to enter the proscribed areas were forcibly expelled by order of the Russian authorities, while other Americans, non-Jews, but otherwise of identical status, were permitted freely to reside, travel, and transact business throughout Russia.

The State Department was thus forced to decide, exactly as it is forced to decide now, whether it would submit passively to the demands of religious prejudice or instead would endeavor to enforce throughout the world, even in those areas where it might be difficult or embarrassing to do so, the rights of American citizens of every religious persuasion, without distinction or difference. The State Department did not a hundred years ago hesitate to assume responsibility for all Americans, including American Jews, and it would be unconscionable and delinquent for any agency of our Government now to do less.

When protests were made during the 1880's that American Jews were systematically expelled from certain parts of Russia, repeated attempts were made by American diplomats, first by exhortation and moral argument, to persuade the Russian Government to adopt a more humane attitude toward its own Jewish population and to extend to American Jews treatment equal in all respects to that accorded all other Americans. When these moral entreaties failed, this Government moved firmly and decisively and abrogated the longstanding and profitable commercial treaty of 1832 between this country and Russia. Because of the failure of the Czarist regime to refrain from further anti-Semitic discrimination against American Jews, these treaty relations were never resumed.

The mere recital of the facts cannot fully disclose the high quality and courage of statesmanship, fully cognizant of all of its responsibilities, that culminated in this action. Some of the notes on this question prepared and dispatched by our highest diplomatic officers remain instructive in reminding us of the manner and context in which decisions affecting international behavior of this kind must be formulated.

Among those who were most forthright and uncompromising in demanding that the Russian Government deal with all Americans equally and fairly was John W. Foster, the American Minister to St. Petersburg and the grandfather of the present Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. It is an unusual family and an unusual historical era that permits grandfather and grandson during successive periods to pass directly upon the same urgent problem. It is to be hoped that Secretary Dulles will reconsider and examine the precepts and policies laid down on behalf of the

United States by his grandfather, himself later to become an eminent Secretary of State, and that he will find implicit in those policies a moral view and a national commitment of lasting and enduring force.

In the late summer of 1880, Henry Pinkos, an American Jew who had assumed residence in St. Petersburg for several months with his wife and family and had established a small business there, was expelled from the city and the country as soon as his Jewish identity became known. Despite efforts by American officials to delay execution of his expulsion, Mr. Pinkos left Russia without awaiting further steps in his behalf. The Chargé d'Affaires of the American Legation thereupon was disposed to drop the whole matter, stating that "there now appears to be no necessity for my communicating with the Russian Government."

Mr. Foster who was then newly appointed United States Minister to St. Petersburg and the then Secretary of State William N. Evarts, were agreed, however, that there was a principle in issue that transcended Mr. Pinkos and whose significance in no way depended upon his physical presence in Russia. Rejecting an easy opportunity to evade a difficult and troubling issue and disregarding staff suggestions that we silently absorb the affront to our Jewish citizens because the issue had become moot, Mr. Foster wrote in clear and unmistakable terms to Baron Jomini, acting Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs:

"The Secretary of State instructs me to state to Your Excellency that in the presence of the fact that an American citizen has been ordered to leave Russia on no other ground than that he is the professor of a particular creed or the holder of certain religious views, it becomes the duty of the Government of the United States, which impartially seeks to protect all of its citizens of whatever origin or faith, solemnly, but with all respect to the Government of His Imperial Majesty, to protest. As this order of expulsion is understood to apply to all foreign Jews, in certain cities or localities, at least, of Russia, it is, of course, apparent that the same is not directed specially against the government of which Mr. Pinkos is a citizen, and, indeed, the longstanding amity which has united the interests of Russia with those of the Government of the United States would of itself forbid a remote supposition that such might be the case. Notwithstanding this aspect of the matter the United States could not fail to look upon the expulsion of one of its citizens from Russia, on the simple ground of his religious ideas or convictions, except as a grievance, akin to that which Russia would doubtless find in the expulsion of one of her own subjects from the United States, on the ground of his attachment to the faith of his fathers" (Foreign Relations, 1880, p. 881, et seq.).

It is significant that Mr. Foster's intercession was not inhibited or deterred by the fact that the anti-Semitism practiced by the Russian Government was universal and "not directed specially against the government of which Mr. Pinkos is a citizen." Mr. Foster was aware that the larger interests of the United States dictate forthright opposition to all religious prejudice aimed at or affecting Americans whether our citizens are made to suffer indignity and insult as part of a general campaign of hatred and bigotry or directly in their capacity as American nationals. In either case our citizens are deprived of rights this country is committed to protect, and in either case this foreign conduct constitutes an encroachment upon American freedoms that must be required and corrected.

Exactly as Arab extremists seek to manufacture an apology for their terrorism and to justify current anti-Jewish excesses as a security measure designed to protect them from supposed Zionist violence, so did the

Czarist regime strive to rationalize its anti-Semitic decrees as a protection against a supposed Jewish insurrection. To this Mr. Foster replied:

"It having been intimated to the Secretary of State by this Legation that the reason of this order may be found in the supposed implication of Jews in the plots formed against the life of His Imperial Majesty the Emperor, the Secretary directs me to say that, insofar as this may be true, the Government of Russia has the entire sympathy of the Government of the United States in all just preventive efforts; and if there existed any good evidence that Mr. Pinkos has been connected with any of these attempts, the Government of the United States could not object to this expulsion on that ground. But neither the police authorities, in the several communications which the members of the consulate general and this Legation have had with them, in their efforts to obtain relief for Mr. Pinkos, nor Your Excellency's Department, in the notes addressed to this Legation on the subject, have ever intimated the existence of such a charge. Nor does the character of citizens of the United States of Jewish faith afford ground for the supposition that they would be likely to engage in conspiracies or plots against the established Government of the country. From the foundation of the United States as a nation they have been entitled to full and unrestricted privileges of citizens, and have shown themselves to be peaceable and law observing in their conduct, quiet and industrious in their habits, and are esteemed a valuable portion of the community, so that, insofar as the regulation for the expulsion of foreign Jews from Russia affects American citizens, whatever may be the conduct of their coreligionists of this or other countries, it is an unjust reflection upon American Jews as a class and a discrimination which cannot be acquiesced in by my Government" (ibid.).

When these notes were insufficient, Mr. Foster continued to press his demands with untiring vigor. In a letter to the Secretary of State on March 25, 1881, he was the first to suggest that this country base its demands for equal treatment for American Jews upon the treaty of 1832 and employatory to that treaty as a means of enforcing the influence and status we enjoyed as a signing our claims (Foreign Relations, 1881, at p. 1012). This device, in fact, became the solution finally adopted.

Mr. Foster enjoyed the support and encouragement of his superiors in the State Department. As has already been noted, Secretary Evarts first directed Mr. Foster's intervention with the Russian Government. Upon Secretary Evarts' death, his successor, James G. Blaine, shortly after his appointment, unreservedly ratified Foster's strong position. He wrote Foster as follows:

"Your course appears to have been discreet, and it is hoped that you will press your representations to the successful establishment of the principle of religious toleration for our citizens peacefully residing or traveling abroad, which we as a nation have such a deep interest in maintaining. \* \* \*

"It would be, in the judgment of this government, absolutely inadmissible that a domestic law restraining native Hebrews from residence in certain parts of the empire might operate to hinder any American citizen. \* \* \*

"I need hardly enlarge on the point that the Government of the United States concludes its treaties with foreign states for the equal protection of all classes of American citizens. It can make absolutely no discrimination between them, whatever be their origin or creed. So that they abide by the laws, at home or abroad, it must give them due protection and expect like protection for them. Any unfriendly or discriminatory act

against them on the part of a foreign power with which we are at peace would call for our earnest remonstrance, whether a treaty existed or not" (Foreign Relations, 1881, p. 1030).

The American people were no less sensitive to these deprivations based upon religious affiliation. When diplomatic intercession alone failed to correct this anti-Semitic discrimination, the issue became one for general public notice and for more direct executive and legislative action. Indeed, it became a matter of such moment that in his speech of acceptance of the Republican nomination for the Presidency in 1908, William H. Taft noted that "in some countries \* \* \* distinctions are made in respect to the treatment of our citizens travelling abroad and having passports of our executive, based on considerations which are repugnant to the principles of our Government and civilization." He committed his party and administration "to make every endeavor to secure the solution of such distinctions which in our eyes are both needless and opprobrious." (Adler and Margalith, *With Firmness in the Right* (1946), at pp. 281-282.)

On December 4, 1911, conclusively to dispose of this issue, Joint Resolution 166 was introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative, later Governor, William Sulzer, of New York. The text of the resolution declared:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the people of the United States assert as a fundamental principle that the rights of its citizens shall not be impaired at home or abroad because of race or religion; that the Government of the United States concluded its treaties for the equal protection of all classes of its citizens, without regard to race or religion; that the Government of the United States will not be a party to any treaty which discriminates, or which by one of the parties thereto is so construed as to discriminate between American citizens on the ground of race or religion; that the Government of Russia has violated the treaty between the United States and Russia, concluded at St. Petersburg, December 18, 1832, refusing to honor American passports duly issued to American citizens, on account of race and religion; that in the judgment of the Congress the said treaty, for the reasons aforesaid, ought to be terminated at the earliest possible time; that for the aforesaid reasons the said treaty is hereby declared to be terminated and of no further force and effect from the expiration of 1 year after date of notification to the Government of Russia of the terms of this resolution, and that to this end the President is hereby charged with the duty of communicating such notice to the Government of Russia."

This resolution was adopted by a vote of 300 to 1 on December 13, 1911. On December 15, 1911, Mr. Sazanoff, then Russian Foreign Minister, was notified by Secretary of State Philander C. Knox that the United States had decided to abrogate the treaty of 1832.

Although this was perhaps the most extensive action yet undertaken to protect the rights of American Jews from foreign anti-Semitism it met with immediate and widespread popular approval. Thus, the Republican National Convention of 1912 adopted a plank declaring:

"We approve the action taken by the President and Congress to secure with Russia, as with other countries, a treaty that will recognize the absolute right of expatriation, and that will prevent all discrimination of whatever kind between American citizens, whether native born or alien, and regardless of race, religion, or previous political allegiance. The right of asylum is a precious possession of the people of the United States, and it is to be neither surrendered nor re-

stricted" (American Jewish Year Book, 1913-14, p. 442).

Almost identical planks were adopted the same year by the Democratic and Progressive Party Conventions. The American people have consistently abjured any suggestion, whether by internal decree or foreign treaty, that there can be class distinctions among American citizens or that there are varying degrees of protection to which our citizens are entitled.

#### B. Switzerland

One of the earlier intercessions of this Government on behalf of American Jews abroad perhaps illustrates better than any other the personal zeal with which American statesmen have endeavored to combat foreign anti-Semitism.

In 1853, Theodore S. Fay, then United States Minister to Switzerland, was advised that Swiss cantons were denying visiting rights to American Jews. The Swiss Federal Council was willing to interpret liberally the treaty of 1850 between the United States and Switzerland and to extend to American Jews the same rights and privileges granted American Christians. Some of the cantons, however, persisted in their discrimination and refused to permit American Jews to establish themselves within their jurisdiction.

Mr. Fay became absorbed in the whole problem of anti-Jewish prejudices and made a detailed study of the condition of the Jews in Switzerland and neighboring countries, inquiring even into matters ranging far beyond those affecting American Jews. The Secretary of State encouraged Mr. Fay in this inquiry and notified him that the removal of oppressive restrictions upon the Jewish community was "a matter which the President (Buchanan) has much at heart." (See Ex. Doc. No. 76, House of Representatives, 36th Cong., 1st sess., p. 22.)

As a result of his extensive inquiry and investigation, Fay wrote the famous Israelite Note, which he circulated among the respective cantons. The then President of the Swiss Confederation, Dr. Furrer, wrote that as a result of Fay's note "an immense majority of the Council of Zurich is disposed to change the legislation respecting the Israelites in the interest of amity and progress" (ibid., p. 77). Many other cantons followed and gradually, one after another, removed all restrictions against the Jews. Thus, because of his personal concern over the oppression of religious minorities, an American Minister in Switzerland was able to play a decisive and crucial role in amending the Swiss constitutional system to eliminate all Swiss discrimination because of race and religion and, almost singlehandedly, was instrumental in restoring to American Jews the right to travel throughout that part of Europe without restraint or inhibition.

#### C. Other countries

Our deep attachment to the concept of religious freedom has motivated our Government to urge intercession even in instances of religious suppression and persecution that did not directly affect citizens of the protesting states and even if such protest entailed direct criticism of the internal legislation of other states, a matter not ordinarily within the purview of any foreign power. Thus in the very first representation relating to Jews made by the United States to any foreign state, Secretary of State John Forsyth at the direction of President Van Buren, in 1840 in a dispatch to the American Consul at Alexandria, Egypt, urged intervention in behalf of Damascus Jews who had been accused of murder.

Since that time the diplomatic record is studded with instances of genuinely altruistic intervention by American officials on behalf of persecuted Jewish populations abroad. See the account of protests made

by the United States Government because of local anti-Jewish persecution in Morocco in 1863 (Adler and Margalith, *With Firmness in the Right* (1946), at 11); in Persia in 1897 (ibid., at 16); in Syria and Palestine in 1915 (ibid., at 65); in Italy in 1938 (ibid., at 386); in North Africa in 1942 (ibid., at 410); and in Argentina in 1943 (ibid., at 430). This is not even to mention the strenuous protest made through every available diplomatic medium against the atrocities of Nazi Germany. Indeed, the sense of revulsion against the barbarities of the Nazis and their attempt to import racial doctrines into the United States was one of America's moral armaments in the days of President Franklin D. Roosevelt (ibid., at p. 348 et seq.).

This brief review of American diplomatic practice indicates a continuing course of conduct by American foreign officers extending over 100 years to protest religious persecution by foreign states adversely affecting American citizens.

It is therefore both disappointing and disturbing that Secretary Dulles' recent testimony intimates that the United States in effect has acquiesced and yielded to the demands of current Arab and anti-Jewish aggression, even to the point of sacrificing some of the protection legally due its citizens. We do not believe it an adequate justification that this retreat has been undertaken in the hope of finding a way in which the Arab countries and the United States may live together in a manner which presumably is to their mutual advantage. We do not believe that the American people will concur in this bargain or will endorse or accept any diplomatic approach that requires the United States to hold the rights of its citizens less dear than did our predecessors. We are convinced that the only reason this position could ever have been suggested is that the full measure of American concessions required to meet the demands of Arab bigotry has not been completely understood. It is in the hope of correcting this general lack of information that this paper has been compiled. We are convinced that once the facts are fully and publicly stated, the people of this country and those who have been appointed to guide its foreign relations will be in a better position to assess and evaluate those factors that must dictate our future conduct if the freedoms of all our citizens are to be assured.

#### II. CURRENT ARAB ANTI-JEWISH PRACTICES

The discriminatory actions practiced by the Arab countries under the direction of the Arab League fall into three categories: A, the denial of entry or transit visas to American Jews; b, the commercial boycott of American Jewish businesses; c, the establishment and subvention of large-scale Arab propaganda centers to disseminate anti-Semitic literature in the United States. Each of these three practices is discussed below.

##### A. Denial of entry or transit visas to American Jews

In recent years various Arab countries including Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia have sought to extend and promote their programs of domestic anti-Semitism by promulgating a rule flatly prohibiting the issuance of entry permits and travel visas to American citizens who are Jews. This discrimination extends to Government officials and to members of the United States Armed Forces. A number of invidious consequences have flowed from this Arab policy: American State laws against discrimination in employment have been openly and repeatedly flouted, and recruiting for employment, even on defense contracts paid for by American taxpayers, has been conducted on a discriminatory basis because of Arab refusal to admit American Jewish workers. Thus, Arab bigotry has already forced its

way across our own borders and infected our own domestic practices.

(1) Restrictions Against Military Personnel

On May 20, 1955, a chaplain serving in the United States Air Force wrote Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN:

"United States Air Forces Europe (USAFE) Manual 30-1, dated June 1953 deals with 'Clearance and Documentations for Leave and Duty Travel' for members of the United States Air Force. In section XXVI, paragraph 3, we read: 'Individuals of Jewish faith or descent are strictly barred entrance to or transit of Saudi Arabia. Further, any passport containing an Israeli visa will not be honored.'

"In section XIII, paragraph 3c we read: 'Individuals of the Hebrew race will not be issued visas or admitted to Jordan.'

"By restricting the travels of a Jewish serviceman on military aircraft, the Military Air Transport Service (MATS), a lawful agency of the Government of the United States of America, subjects itself to the bigoted religious doctrines of a foreign power."

This letter elicited the following reply on June 20, 1955, from Harold E. Talbott, then Secretary of the Air Force, to whom it was forwarded by Senator LEHMAN:

"The countries of Saudi Arabia and Jordan for purposes of internal security will not issue a visa for persons of the Hebrew race. This restriction is not only applicable to American citizens, but applies to Jewish people of all nations. Further, Arabic countries, specifically Saudi Arabia and Jordan, will not issue a visa to any person regardless of race, if the passport of the individual is stamped with any marking which would indicate that the traveler had visited Israel prior to the application for entrance into Saudi Arabia and Jordan.

"These restrictions are promulgated and enforced by the Arabic countries and are not within the prerogative of the State Department or the military to change.

"The only exception to the above procedures is when the traveler receives special permission from the Arabic Government concerned to enter that country."

Senator LEHMAN wrote to Mr. Talbott on July 12, 1955:

"I have your letter of June 20. I am aware of the practice of the Governments of Saudi Arabia and Jordan in barring entrance to persons of Jewish faith. I had hoped, however, that the appropriate departments of the United States Government would work ceaselessly against any such regulation insofar as it affects American citizens. I was especially shocked to know that American GI's who happen to be of the Jewish faith are likewise discriminated against. I hoped that far from simply taking cognizance of the matter, the Air Force would use its influence to the extent possible to see that this discrimination was not practiced against Americans who were serving their country in the Air Force."

Secretary Talbott's answer, dated July 20, 1955, exhibits an odd lack of concern:

"The Air Force is cognizant of the situation concerning restriction of travel to members of the Jewish faith to Saudi Arabia and Jordan. However, it must be recognized that we are dealing with a tradition of long standing, and in all probabilities, will take much effort and time on the part of all governmental agencies, including the Air Force, to try and work out a satisfactory solution with the countries concerned. The Air Force together with governmental agencies, has worked ceaselessly to abrogate regulations of this nature put into effect by foreign governments which affect American citizens. Unfortunately, as indicated in my previous letter, these restrictions or regulations are promulgated and enforced by foreign countries and are not within the prerogative of the Air Force to change."

When, on February 24 of this year Secretary Dulles was specifically asked by members of the Foreign Relations Committee whether, pursuant to the terms of the Mutual Security Agreement between this country and Saudi Arabia, American Army personnel of the Jewish faith were not permitted to be stationed at the Dhahran Air Base, the Secretary replied, "It may be." We question Mr. Dulles' apparent belief that his further statement "over a long period of years there has been a prohibition on Jews in Saudi Arabia" can be a sufficient explanation for this Government's tolerance of foreign disqualification of American military personnel because of their religious beliefs.

We submit that continued collaboration in the exclusion of Jewish servicemen invites manifold invasion of the rights of American citizenship. If we accept the principle that foreign states are to be permitted to pass upon the religious qualification of any American in military service stationed abroad, reaching down even to the level of private soldier, then we necessarily become party to the negation of the constitutional concept of religious freedom and religious privacy. We should then be required to screen and survey the religious convictions of prospective public officials who may otherwise be fully competent and qualified. We would then be able to employ as our representatives abroad, whether as ambassador, technician, soldier, or clerk, only those whose religious beliefs correspond favorably to those of some foreign ruler. In contravention of express constitutional prohibitions, we should inevitably be obliged to impose a religious test for public office. The logical extension of this approach would require, obviously, that any emissary of this country sent, for example, to Communist countries should be required to pass Communist tests of non-religious fitness. The absurdity and inequity of this practice seems patent.

That the first amendment to the United States Constitution obligates this country to refrain from entering into any treaty or agreement that might serve as an instrument for discriminating against any group of American citizens by limiting their right freely to travel abroad because of their religious convictions was plainly stated by Clifton R. Breckinridge, American Minister to St. Petersburg in 1895 in a note to the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs. Replying to a Russian contention that the American Constitution could not apply to Russian domestic legislation and therefore could not be invoked to interfere with treaty arrangements between the two States, the American minister declared:

"Our Constitution does not say that Congress shall not make a law simply 'prohibiting' or 'authorizing' a religious exercise or belief, as Your Excellency seems to understand.

"It says that 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, nor prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' Certainly if a law deprives any people or persons of a certain faith, because of that faith, of all or of any part of the rights, privileges, and immunities enjoyed by any other citizen, or class of citizens, it is made 'respecting' that religion, and it militates against the 'free exercise thereof,' as much so as if the sect had been mentioned in the title of the act and the consequences had been named as pains and penalties for the conscientious belief and observances entertained and practiced" (Foreign Relations, 1895, p. 1066).

We suggest that a proper attitude, one consonant with the requirements of our Constitution and with our own national temper, is reflected in the action of the United States in the one prior time in its history when one of its representatives was found unacceptable by a foreign country because of admittedly religious factors.

(a) The Kelley precedent

In May 1885 President Grover Cleveland appointed Mr. Anthony M. Kelley, of Virginia, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States at Vienna. The United States was informed, however, that Mr. Kelley would be unacceptable to the Austrian Government because "the position of a foreign envoy wedded to a Jewess by civil marriage would be untenable and even impossible in Vienna" (Foreign Relations, 1885, p. 48).

Secretary of State Bayard replied in unmistakable language:

"The supreme law of this land expressly declares that 'no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States,' and by the same authority it is declared that 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.'

"It is not within the power of the President nor of the Congress, nor of any judicial tribunal in the United States, to take or even hear testimony, or in any mode to inquire into or decide upon the religious belief of any official, and the proposition to allow this to be done by any foreign Government is necessarily and a fortiori inadmissible.

"To suffer an infraction of this essential principle would lead to a disfranchisement of our citizens because of their religious belief, and thus impair or destroy the most important end which our constitution of government was intended to secure.

"The case we are now considering is that of an envoy of the United States, unquestionably fitted, morally and intellectually, and who has been duly accredited to a friendly government, toward which he is thoroughly well affected; who in accordance with the laws of this country, has long since contracted and has maintained an honorable marriage, and whose presence near the foreign government in question is objected to by its agents on the sole ground that his wedded wife is alleged to entertain a religious faith which is held by very many of the most honored and valued citizens of the United States.

"It is not believed by the President that a doctrine and practice so destructive of religious liberty and freedom of conscience, so devoid of catholicity, and so opposed to the spirit of the age in which we live can for a moment be accepted by the great family of civilized nations or be allowed to control their diplomatic intercourse.

"Certain it is, it will never, in my belief, be accepted by the people of the United States, nor by any administration which represents their sentiments" (Foreign Relations, 1885, p. 48).

The Austrian Government thereupon changed the ground of its opposition to a supposed "want of political tact evinced on his (Mr. Kelley's) part on a former occasion, in consequence of which a friendly power declined to receive him; and upon the certainty that his domestic relations preclude that reception of him by Vienna society, which we judge desirable for the representatives of the United States with which power we wish to continue the friendly relations existing between the two Governments" (Foreign Relations, 1885, p. 55).

This country, however, was not deceived by these representations and refused to appoint an envoy in Mr. Kelley's stead. The position of this Government was that the acts of Austria and her ministers in this case would require this country to agree to permit Austria to reserve for herself the right to prescribe a religious test for office in the United States and that this could never be found acceptable by the people of this country. In his annual message to Congress,

December 8, 1885, President Cleveland reviewed the entire case:

"Question has arisen with the Government of Austria-Hungary touching the representation of the United States at Vienna. Having, under my constitutional prerogative, appointed an estimable citizen of unimpeachable probity and competence as Minister at that court, the Government of Austria-Hungary invited this Government to take cognizance of certain exceptions, based upon allegations against the personal acceptability of Mr. Kelley, the appointed envoy, asking that in view thereof, the appointment should be withdrawn. The reasons advanced were such as could not be acquiesced in, without violation of my oath of office and the precepts of the Constitution, since they necessarily involved a limitation in favor of a foreign government upon the right of selection by the Executive, and required such an application of a religious test as a qualification for office under the United States as would have resulted in the practical disfranchisement of a large class of our citizens and the abandonment of a vital principle in our Government. The Austro-Hungarian Government finally decided not to receive Mr. Kelley as the envoy of the United States, and that gentleman has since resigned his commission, leaving the post vacant. I have made no new nomination, and the interests of this Government in Vienna are now in the care of the secretary of legation, acting as chargé d'affaires ad interim" (Foreign Relations, 1885, p. 1v).

(b) The Government plea of noninterference

Unquestionably the qualification of an ambassadorial appointee depends in considerable measure upon his standing in the country in which he is designated to serve. It is not diplomatic custom for any state to impose an unwelcome envoy upon another. The grant of diplomatic standing normally is regarded as the exclusive prerogative of the host state. This country nevertheless felt that the exercise of religious prejudice in the Kelley case was a matter of sufficient importance to override all considerations of diplomatic practice. How much greater an affront is it, therefore, for the Arab States to dictate to our Armed Forces with respect to the religious affiliations of our military personnel ordered to serve in our defense installations in Arab lands. The religious beliefs of members of the Armed Forces of the United States can be no business of the Arab countries and it is a gross invasion of the constitutional guaranties of religious freedom for any agency of this Government to agree to the exclusion of Jewish servicemen, or indeed Jewish public officials of any rank, from acting on behalf of their country anywhere in the world.

It is plainly no argument to allege, as Secretary Talbot alleges, that since these restrictions on the entry of Jewish military personnel are enforced by the Arab countries they are "not within the prerogative of the State Department or the military to change." Matters that impinge so directly upon the welfare and liberty of American citizens cannot thus be so immunized from American intervention. It should be remembered that upon proper occasion the United States has not been unwilling to instruct its diplomatic emissaries abroad to take action with respect to matters that entail criticism of the internal activities of another state, something that is not within the ordinary purview of normal diplomatic conduct. Thus, on November 22, 1881, in seeking to persuade Great Britain to join in protest against Russian anti-Semitic discrimination, Secretary of State Blaine wrote James Russell, then United States Minister at London:

"I am well aware that the domestic enactments of a state toward its own subjects is not generally regarded as a fit matter for the intervention of another independent power.

But when such enactments directly affect the liberty and property of foreigners who resort to a country under the supposed guaranty of treaties framed for the most liberal ends, when the conscience of an alien owing no allegiance whatever to the local sovereignty, is brought under the harsh yoke of bigotry or prejudice which bows the necks of the natives, and when enlightened appeals made to humanity, to the principles of just reciprocity and to the advancing spirit of the age, in behalf of tolerance, are met with intimations of a purpose to still further burden the unhappy sufferers and so to necessarily increase the disability of foreigners of like creed \* \* \* it becomes in a high sense a moral duty to our citizens and to the doctrines of religious freedom we so strongly uphold, to seek proper protection for those citizens and tolerance for their creed, in foreign lands, even at the risk of criticism of the municipal laws of other states" (Kohler, *The United States and German Jewish Prosecutions*, pp. 40-41).

It always will remain possible to search out reasons for not acting but the present prim and circumspect regard for every legalism that might justify American indifference must be contrasted with the attitude of former Secretary of State William N. Evarts. He did not hesitate to employ the power of his high office to instruct an American consul in Morocco that while intervention by this country in behalf of Jews who are Moorish subjects ordinarily might be considered improper, "Still, there might be cases in which humanity would dictate a disregard of technicalities, if your influence would shield Hebrews from oppression." (Letters of Secretary Evarts, March 20, 1878, quoted in J. B. Moore, *American Diplomacy* (1905), page 349.) We are forced to conclude that American diplomatic intervention against the Arab States is more likely deterred by lack of will than by lack of legal warrant.

(2) Restrictions Upon Private Travel

In the face of this official indifference toward limitations imposed upon the right to travel of military and Government personnel, it is hardly surprising that travel restrictions against American Jews who are merely private citizens should continue with almost no comment. The Passport Division of the Department of State expressly informs applicants for passports that persons of Jewish faith will be denied the right to visit Arab lands. Information supplied to passengers departing America aboard ships of the American Export Lines, which during cruises touch ports in Arab countries, declares that persons of Jewish faith or Jewish name (sic) will be denied certain cruise travel privileges in Arab countries freely available to other passengers. Airlines regularly traveling to Arab countries contain notations in their schedules indicating that Jewish passengers will not be allowed to disembark at Arab ports of entry.

This regular withholding of travel privileges by Arab officials in this country from American citizens of Jewish faith is demeaning and introduces a discordant and dissonant note in a free community. Thus, in 1895 Acting Secretary of State Alvey A. Adee reminded the American Minister at St. Petersburg that the refusal of Russian consuls to grant visas to American Jews was of continuing concern to this country if only because of the impact and effect of this practice within our own borders. Mr. Adee wrote:

"Apart from the constitutional objections to the discrimination made by Russian consular officers against American Jews, this Government can never consent that a class embracing many of its most honored and valuable citizens shall within its territory be subjected to invidious and disparaging distinctions of the character implied in refusing to visé their passports. For, notwithstanding Prince Lobanow's suggestion

that his Government's consular regulation upon the subject under consideration does not apply to all Israelites and therefore cannot be regarded as a discrimination against them on religious grounds, the fact remains that the interrogatories propounded to applicants for the consular visé relate to religious faith, and upon the response depends the consul's actions.

"Viewed in the light of an invidious discrimination tending to discredit and humiliate American Jews in the eyes of their fellow citizens, it is plain that the action of Russian consular officers does produce its effect within American territory, and not exclusively in Russian jurisdiction" (Foreign Relations, 1895, p. 1067).

The denial of visas to Jews by Arab countries, moreover, frequently has a more serious consequence than the mere withholding of travel for pleasure. Arab anti-Semitism has been made the occasion and excuse for anti-Jewish discrimination in hiring practices in this country, in direct contravention of the purpose and policy of State fair employment practices legislation.

(a) SCAD and private employment

In 1950 a help-wanted advertisement inserted by a private employment agency in New York City newspapers sought welders for foreign service. When applicants for these positions were interrogated about their religious beliefs, a complaint was filed with the New York State Commission Against Discrimination charging that these inquiries constituted an unlawful employment practice.

The State Commission reported:

"Investigation disclosed that the welders were being recruited by a sub-contractor of the Arabian American Oil Co. for work on a pipeline in one of the Arabian countries, and that a visa from the Arabian Government was a prerequisite to employment.

"The investigating commissioner was informed by the Arabian American Oil Co. that the Arabian Government does not issue visas to persons of the Jewish faith. The company advised that it had an understanding with the Arabian Government to screen all prospective employees for work in Arabia before they applied for Arabian visas, for the purpose of excluding persons of the Jewish faith to whom visas will not be granted. The respondent urged the Commission not to take any action which would jeopardize this agreement in view of considerations important to the international interests and security of the United States.

"Pursuant to Commission policy to seek confirmation of the facts upon which the existence of a bona fide occupational qualification is predicated, the investigating commissioner communicated with the United States Department of State. He was advised by the Political Adviser for the Office of African and Near Eastern Affairs that as a result of the recent conflict between the Arabian countries and Israel, the Arabian governments refuse to grant visas to persons of the Jewish faith for work in any of the Arabian countries. This representative of the Department of State stressed the importance of not having anything interfere with the existing relationship between the Arabian Government and the Arabian American Oil Co., explaining that this relationship was the basis for the harmony between this Government and the Arabian Government and should it be disturbed in any way the international interests of the United States would be seriously affected." (Report of Progress, 1950, New York State Commission Against Discrimination, pp. 47-48.)

As a result of State Department intervention, the New York State Commission Against Discrimination found these employment practices not violative of State law. Two factors are worthy of note in this report.

First, it is indicative of the contagious effect of religious bigotry that an American employer in New York should enter into an understanding with Arabian Governments to screen American citizens who are candidates for employment "for the purpose of excluding persons of the Jewish faith." Thus, in direct contradiction of the intention and purpose of existing State fair employment practices legislation American employers are induced and even compelled to undertake religious inquiries and to fix religious standards as a qualification in hiring practices.

Secondly, it is shocking that a "representative of the Department of State (should have) stressed the importance of not having anything interfere with the existing relationship between the Arab Government and the Arabian American Oil Co." It should be remembered that the "anything" that might in this case have disturbed this relationship would have been a demand for the full and equal protection of the rights of American citizens. It is bad statesmanship as well as bad principle that our traditional concept of equal protection should be abandoned for the purpose of furthering certain commercial transactions, whether they be with the Arabian American Oil Co., or with anyone else. It is not true that the American people are willing to maintain contractual arrangements for international exchange of commodities, whatever they may be, when such arrangements are made contingent upon implementing in our own community the religious or racial hatreds and prejudices of foreign governments. Private deals cannot be sanctioned when they are made at the cost of national ideals.

#### (b) Defense contracts abroad

It is even more disturbing that Arab anti-Semitism has been made the occasion for the practice of religious discrimination by United States Army contractors engaged in defense projects, projects paid for by all the American people. The New York Times of February 2, 1952, reported that Maj. Gen. G. J. Nold, Deputy Chief of Engineers, United States Army, testified before a Senate subcommittee that New York workers were not recruited by Army contractors for building military bases in Arab countries because the contractors believed a large number of New York applicants would be of Jewish origin and, if hired, would be resented by the Arabs and possibly be in personal danger. It is not surprising that this was precisely the argument advanced by Russian Foreign Minister Prince Lobanow in 1895 to justify his government's refusal to visé the passports of American Jews, explaining that his country's attitude was essentially philanthropic, serving to warn American Jews while they were still in the United States and thus save them from "difficulties and dangers which they would encounter later if they had not been advised." (Adler and Margalith, op. cit, supra, at 250.) In any event, either forgetful of SCAD's prior ruling or uncertain whether the Army would be granted the same special license to discriminate previously accorded the Arabian American Oil Co., the New York State Employment Service had informed the airbase contractors that they must operate in conformity with the State law against discrimination in employment and could not screen out Jewish applicants for the jobs. General Nold testified that the contractors thereafter simply avoided the New York labor market and recruited their entire work force in the Middle West.

In response to an inquiry by the chairman of the New York State Commission Against Discrimination, the then Secretary of the Army, Frank Pace, Jr. on March 3, 1952, wrote:

"The charge that the Army has refused to recruit workers from New York for construction work in Arab countries because

New York law prohibits discrimination in the hiring of workers has resulted from the recent testimony of the Deputy Chief of Engineers before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee. The Deputy Chief of Engineers there testified that a problem existed in recruiting people of the Jewish faith for work in Arab countries. Insofar as this testimony indicated that there were problems in recruiting Jewish workers for every country having an Arab population, the statements of the Deputy Chief of Engineers were broader than the facts justified. Although his testimony was not so limited, actually the Deputy Chief of Engineers was cognizant of the recruitment problem with respect to the country of Saudi Arabia. The situation there, however, is not one caused by Corps of Engineers contractors. These contractors have not discriminated against qualified Jewish workers for Saudi Arabian projects. They are willing to recruit workers of this faith; however, these workers are unable to obtain the required visas from Saudi Arabia."

This comment by Secretary Pace is characteristic of official nonchalance and indifference to this problem. It reflects the too frequently held view that mere reference to Arab anti-Semitism is all that is necessary to condone American collaboration in discriminatory acts. During the course of his letter to the chairman of the State commission, the Secretary claimed that contractors recruiting workers in the United States for military construction in North Africa by and large conform to the policies laid down by President Truman barring discrimination based on race, creed, color, and national origin; but he also admitted, somewhat coolly, that contractors do, in fact, discriminate against workers of Jewish faith in recruiting for military construction in Saudi Arabia. Government agencies as well as individual contractors usually disclaim any discriminatory intent, even loudly assert that exclusion of Jewish employees is contrary to their own wishes and forced upon them because Jews are refused visas for entry into Saudi Arabia. But the net result is no less an instance of discrimination in Government contracts, in clear, open, and undeniable violation of standing Executive orders.

#### (c) State Department passivity

More is required of the State and Defense Departments than mere passive recognition of existing facts. Regretably, Secretary of State Dulles, like his associates, appears largely undisturbed by the Arab policy of discrimination against American Jews. During his testimony on February 24, 1956, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in response to a question relating to our endorsement of discrimination against American Jewish businessmen, Secretary Dulles found it appropriate to refer to the religious requirements of Moslem law and to indulge in analogies concerning Moslem dietary customs. The general temper of Secretary Dulles' reply may perhaps be evident in his concluding comments that the Arabs "have some practices which we may think curious. . . . We, perforce, accommodate ourselves to certain practices they have which we do not like; they, perhaps, accommodate themselves to certain of our idiosyncrasies which they do not like, but on the whole, they have a pretty arbitrary rule largely dictated by the strict tenets of the Moslem faith."

It ordinarily might be supposed that the practice of religious discrimination against American nationals is not a mere "curious practice" to be likened to exotic dietary habits, nor would it ordinarily be thought properly comparable by an American Secretary of State to folk "idiosyncrasies" of our own to which the Arabs might conceivably object. At issue are national policies that impose serious penalties upon many American citizens and these cannot lightly be dismissed

as quaint, almost charming, eccentricities which we need not trouble to regard seriously.

The occasional objections made by the State Department to this practice of religious discrimination thus far have been palpably inadequate. For all of its perfunctory assurances, the State Department has never indicated the precise nature of its protests or whether those protests when conveyed were pursued with vigor and persistence. Nor has Secretary Dulles, or any other Department spokesman, ever suggested any further course of conduct should our protests, as seems inevitable at present, continue to go unheeded.

The right to travel and to go abroad is a right much treasured and desired, and if the Arab States were suddenly to close their doors to all Americans we should unquestionably deem it to be an affront and unfriendly act. We can properly be no less affronted when the Arab countries single out one group of Americans to whom they bar their borders solely because of religious affiliation. And it becomes doubly unconscionable when this practice, abetted by American participation, becomes the prelude and apology for imposing economic penalties against American Jewish citizens.

It would seem, at the very least, that if any American citizens are barred from entry to any Arab States for religious reasons, this Government, with the exception of necessary and authorized diplomatic personnel, should prohibit all citizens from Arab countries from entry here. There is ample precedent for such a move. Section 243 (g) (7) of the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 authorizes this country to refuse any further immigration from those states who are unwilling to accept return of their nationals who are deported from the United States. Surely the crude religious discrimination practiced by the Arab countries is at least as significant a cause for invoking this reciprocal prohibition. There is no tenable reason for the United States to continue to receive immigration from countries who capriciously and arbitrarily deny an equivalent right to a considerable section of our own citizens. It is a well-established principle that no foreign government can with impunity discriminate between one American passport and another. That principle needs now to be implemented.

#### III. BOYCOTT OF AMERICAN JEWISH BUSINESSES

It is generally conceded that pursuant to a directive of the Arab League there is at present an Arab boycott of businesses throughout the world that have representatives or branches in Israel or that maintain commercial relations with Israeli firms, however small these transactions may be. This is evidenced by a recent statement by the Iraqi Consul in New York, Gen. A. K. Gallani, asserting that:

"Our policy is that all firms, be they Christian, Jew, or Moslem, are not allowed to do business with the Arab countries if they have a subsidiary or branch in Israel. This was a decision of the Arab League, not of Iraq alone, and the reason is that Israel is at war with the Arab countries." (New York Post, February 3, 1956.)

An article recently appearing in the Foreign Commerce Weekly, published by the United States Department of Commerce, further confirms this fact:

"Member states of the Arab League have agreed to take the following actions in implementation of their boycott against countries having relations with both Israel and the Arab countries, the Iraq Government has informed diplomatic missions in Baghdad.

"Imports of products from foreign countries will be banned if the companies have branches or assembly plants in Israel; if their general agents or regional offices in the Middle East are located in Israel; or if Israeli

companies are granted the privilege of using trade names.

"Foreign companies, bodies, and establishments, both public and private, having shares in Israeli firms or plants, will be prohibited from carrying out business in the Arab countries.

"Regularly scheduled foreign steamships passing through Arab ports on both-way trips will not be allowed to anchor in an Israeli port on either journey. Exceptions are world tourist steamships, provided the Arab States through which they are to pass are notified in advance of their names and dates of departure—Embassy Baghdad" (Foreign Commerce Weekly, vol. 51, No. 1, January 4, 1956).

There is irrefutable evidence, moreover, that this anti-Israel boycott has now been expanded into a blacklisting of all businesses throughout the world, whether or not they have branches in Israel, that are owned by Jews, employ Jews, or even subscribe to Jewish philanthropic activities. According to the Economic Bulletin of the Arab League (Cairo), there are now 162 Jewish firms on the blacklist: 45 are British, 44 American, 23 French, 14 Swiss; 11 are in Argentina, 10 in Canada, 8 in Belgium, 6 in Holland, and 1 in Australia. Despite the occasional camouflage that have been attempted, the character of this economic reprisal is now sufficiently clear as to leave no doubt whatever as to its anti-Semitic purposes.

The boycott is conducted by cooperation of a number of the member states of the Arab League. The Saudi Arabian Government has been the most active and consistent in this connection in the United States although other Arab States have also participated with increasing frequency.

#### A. Saudi Arabian boycott

The American Jewish Congress has in its possession correspondence from Arab firms located in Saudi Arabia, canceling contracts with American Jewish businesses because of a directive promulgated by the Saudi Arabian Chamber of Commerce, but unquestionably inspired by the Saudi Arabian Government, instructing Saudi Arabian firms to discontinue all relations with businesses abroad owned or controlled by Jews or that employ Jews. These letters state that any contract negotiated in violation of this directive will be subject to summary cancellation and that any merchandise imported into Saudi Arabia from firms employing Jews abroad will run the risk of confiscation. The Saudi Arabian Government evidently requires its domestic import companies to obtain affirmative and positive assurances that their business associates abroad are free of all Jewish connections.

The claim has been adduced by representatives of the State Department among others that this boycott is not by any official agency in Saudi Arabia but only by private individuals. This contention must be weighed against the undisputed fact that Saudi Arabia is an absolute despotism without any semblance of representative government. It is unthinkable that any influential agency in that country could issue policy directives without the prior knowledge and approval of responsible officials. Moreover, no body other than the government itself would possess authority to confiscate incoming shipments. The Government of Saudi Arabia has plenary authority to impose conditions on international transactions and it must be concluded that, despite the nominal denials glibly issued by their spokesmen and consular representatives in the United States, Saudi Arabian Government officials themselves have stipulated and directed the anti-Jewish restrictions now invoked.

The nature of the discrimination is clearly reflected in the following excerpts from letters in our files received by American firms

owned by Jews from their Saudi Arabian customers. The names of the recipients and senders of these letters are not here disclosed in order not to disturb other commercial relations these firms may have. Photostatic copies of the letters, however, are in American Jewish Congress possession.

January 3, 1952:

"We very much regret to inform you that our Government has duly published a notice announcing that any importers of Saudi Arabia must not be permitted to import the goods, any kind of goods, from any Jewish firms of the world.

"Further, they have listed your name as being your firm is Jewish firm, as these steps are taken suddenly against you, we are obliged to cable you to stop the shipments of our orders until we write you.

"However, we are obliged to ask you to let us have full particulars as to what faith your firm is belong, to Jewish or Christian? And until we have full particulars from you, we are obliged to stop our business with you."

October 1, 1953:

"In connection with our request for not effecting the shipment of our order by any steamer which belongs to any Jewish steamship company. This is in compliance of our Government's regulation announced recently, further this ordinance warns that any shipment by such steamers will not be allowed to enter Saudi Arabia."

September 17, 1953:

"We have also to inform you that you are well aware we are quite prohibited to import any goods manufactured in any Jew factories. Now our Government has issued a new regulation warning all the importers that no goods may be brought by the steamers belonging to Jew steamship company. You are kindly requested to take this matter into consideration in order to avoid any sort of trouble arising by doing so."

September 22, 1953:

"We hope that you have not shipped our order by now. We append the text of notification from our local government, for your kind information and perusal. Merchant or merchants established in Saudi Arabia intended to import goods from foreign countries should know that it is forbidden to deal with a Jewish company or with a company whose any of its workmen is Jewish or has branch in Israel, and if a merchant intended to deal with a company and knows that the same company is not Jewish, should also be asked to submit a letter of certificate issued by the chamber of commerce certifying that neither of its workman is Jewish nor has branch in Israel. Therefore, we will request you to furnish us with a certificate issued by your local chamber of commerce to that effect."

November 27, 1955:

"We refer to your letter dated March 8, 1955, addressed to our associates — from which we gather that you are desirous to establish business relations in Saudi Arabia.

"It may also be noted that according to Saudi Arabian Government's regulation all invoices for the goods supplied must be legalized by Saudi Legation of your side. We are strictly prohibited to deal with Jew firms and therefore it will be appreciated if you can furnish us with a certificate duly legalized by the Saudi Legation stating that your firm is not a Jewish firm, otherwise we regret we shall not be able to enter into business with you."

January 7, 1956:

"With reference to your letter No. IW:ek of November 21, 1955, we have to inform you that you will have to get the original certificate attested and certified by the Saudi Arabian consulate in your country to the effect that firm which exports the machine is not a Jewish firm, without which we cannot have dealings with your firm."

One of the recipients of the letters quoted above regularly exports wheat, flour, rice, and textiles to Saudi Arabia and prior to the boycott his business in that country amounted to about \$2 million a year. No United States export license is required for shipment of these materials but under the terms of the International Wheat Agreement to which both the United States and Saudi Arabia are subject, the United States pays 70 cents for each bushel of wheat shipped as a subsidy to American exporters. The effect of this boycott, therefore, is that the United States Government may make grants to non-Jewish firms shipping wheat to Saudi Arabia, but because of American submission to Arab demands Jewish firms are excluded from comparable benefits.

The discontinuance of contracts by Saudi Arabia importers reflects not only an effort on the part of the Saudi Arabian Government to regulate the conditions of its internal economy, but to reach out far beyond its own borders to boycott what it regards as Jewish enterprise. American Jewish businessmen are flatly excluded from competition for a large segment of international trade. Certainly to the extent that funds used to subsidize this trade derive from tax-payments and other contributions on the part of all the people of this country, it would appear intolerable for any American national to be barred from participation because of religious considerations.

#### B. Boycotts by other Arab countries

Although the boycott carried out by Saudi Arabia has received the greatest attention in this country there are clear indications that other members of the Arab League have carried on an identical policy of barring Jews from international trade. The following excerpts from a letter to the chairman of the Board of Directors of Verkoopkantoor Van der Heem N. V., The Hague, Holland, on November 13, 1955, indicates the firm intention of all members of the Arab League to make the boycott of Jews universal:

"As you are aware the Arab countries are in a state of war with Israel and for this reason we are making an economical siege around that Israel. This siege is administered by a special control and investigation office with members of all the Arab states.

"An officer in said office visited us today and requested that following information be supplied about your company:

"5. Do you have any Jewish employees in your company, if yes how many and what are the positions held by them.

"6. Are there any Jews in your Board of Directors as members.

"7. Is any of your managers or branch managers a Jew, if yes please give name of the department headed by such a man.

"8. Is any of the persons authorized to sign on behalf of your company a Jew.

"9. What is the number of Jewish laborers in your factories and offices."

In a letter quoted below from the Assistant Secretary of State in 1953, the State Department acknowledged that there has been from time to time a blacklisting of American Jewish firms by the Lebanese Government. American newspapers report similar experiences by American Jewish businesses throughout the world in dealing with member states of the Arab League (New York Herald Tribune, February 12, 1956). The boycott now suffered by American Jewish firms is a vital part of the international plan of the Arab League to deny Jewish businesses access to principal markets.

#### C. The reluctant State Department

This matter was first brought to the attention of the State Department in 1952 when reports of his practice were first received by the American Jewish Congress. The issue

presumably was satisfactorily concluded, in May 1952, when in a letter to Senator LEHMAN, Jack K. McFall, Assistant Secretary of the Department of State, declared that the racial and religious restrictions imposed on international dealings by the Saudi Arabian Government had been discontinued effective April of that year:

"I refer again to your note of January 30, 1952, and my reply of February 6 regarding Saudi Arabian trade discrimination against Jewish firms in the United States. As you know, this action and its possible repercussions in this country were matters of real concern to this Department. The delicacy of the problem in Saudi Arabia recommended an informal approach rather than official representations to that Government as best designed to meet with success in causing the discontinuance of that discriminatory practice.

"Several frank but friendly discussions were held with the Saudi Arabian Embassy in Washington and by our Ambassador in Saudi Arabia with appropriate high authorities there. I am now happy to be able to report to you that these efforts have been successful, and the broad restrictive Saudi Arabian decree has been superseded as of April 4, 1952."

Regrettably, however, as is evident from the letters quoted earlier, the boycott of Jewish firms has not, in fact, been stopped and continues even to the present month without any lessening of its force.

#### (1) The claim of "private" boycott

Repeated efforts have been made to persuade the State Department to assert its influence to cause on effective discontinuance of this economic boycott of American Jews. In a letter to Senator LEHMAN on December 15, 1953, the then Assistant Secretary of State, Thruston B. Morton, declared:

"As I informed you in my letter of May 15 last, the Department at that time sought an appropriate occasion to reassert the United States feeling toward the boycott. This presented itself in July, when a report was received from our Embassy in Beirut that there were indications that the Lebanese Government contemplated blacklisting American firms dealing with Israel. The Department promptly took this occasion to instruct the Embassy, and to inform our other Embassies in the area, that if such action were taken it should state in positive terms to the Government of Lebanon that the United States Government was seriously concerned, and that the blacklisting action was unwarranted. Specific points upon which the Department based this position were transmitted to the Embassy for use if the occasion arose, and these points were also relayed to the other Embassies for guidance if they were confronted with a similar situation.

"Insofar as the Department has been informed up to this time, the action reportedly contemplated by the Lebanese Government has not been taken. In fact, the Embassy recently took steps to obtain an import permit for an American consignment in transit to Jordan, which had been refused some time ago by the Lebanese Government, and was successful in obtaining it. We are currently taking steps to remove from a blacklist three American tankers refused permission to enter a Saudi Arabian port.

"One of the cases cited in your letter had been previously brought to our attention and sent to our Embassy in Saudi Arabia for its report. The other case which you cite has now also been referred to the Embassy. The type of discrimination implicit in these cases is indeed serious. The Department hopes that these instances are in the nature of sporadic, out-of-bounds actions based on excessive zeal or misunderstanding on the part of certain individuals rather than an indication of fundamental intensification of boycott practice by the Saudi Arabian Govern-

ment. This hope is supported by the report which we have just received from the Embassy on the first of the two cases reported to it. The Embassy states that it can find no decree of the Saudi Arabian Government barring imports from Jewish firms but is investigating the possibility that a local sheik or other official may have issued an order effective only in his area. A leading figure of the Arab League has also recently indicated to an officer of the Department that discrimination of the type exemplified in the cases under reference is not, to his knowledge, contemplated nor supported by the League."

A letter similar in import was sent to Dr. Nehemiah Robinson, director of the Institute of Jewish Affairs of the World Jewish Congress, on December 30, 1953, by Merrill C. Fay, Officer in Charge, Economic Affairs, Office of Near Eastern Affairs of the Department of State. Mr. Fay's letter declared:

"A report has now been received from the American Embassy in Jidda, Saudi Arabia, in response to the Department's inquiry whether a decree has been issued by that Government prohibiting merchants from trading with Jewish-owned firms in the United States.

"The Embassy reports that Decree No. 3/4/2179 of April 4, 1952, forbids the importation of "Israeli products or the products of foreign companies with branches in Israel." Order No. 11299 of August 26, 1953 (16/12/1372) prohibits this importation of goods on "Israeli ships or through Israeli navigation companies or on foreign ships which may anchor, during the trips to Arab countries, in Israeli ports."

"The Embassy reports further that no official action has been taken by the Saudi Arabian Government against trade with Jewish firms who do not have branches in Israel or engage in trade with Israel through Israeli shipping companies. It would therefore appear that the documentation requirement mentioned in your letter has no official status.

"The Embassy speculates that some Saudi Arabian importers entertain apparently groundless fears that their goods might be confiscated, under one of the foregoing regulations, if the supplying firm bore a Jewish name, may have written to their American connections that a certificate by the local chamber of commerce should accompany their shipments. There is nothing that the Department can do, unfortunately, to cause them to desist from such a practice which does not appear to accord with their government's regulations.

"You may rest assured, however, that this situation is being kept under constant study by the Department, and that all appropriate steps will be taken to protect the interests of American exporters."

It has already been suggested that the use of private fronts to conceal official governmental boycott of American Jewish firms is an obvious dodge, one designed to permit Arab countries to engage in anti-Semitic discrimination against American citizens while pleading innocent of any implications in these acts. The insistence by Arab exporters upon a certificate on non-Jewish ownership is too regular and consistent to be attributable only to "excessive zeal" on the part of some "local sheik." It would be naive to suppose that such a widespread pattern of conduct could be sustained without the approval and participation of Government agencies.

Occasionally, the mask has slipped. Recent newspaper accounts indicate that Arab diplomatic officers in this country have admitted Government sponsorship of the discriminatory boycott. The New York Mirror, December 29, 1955, reported the existence of a Saudi Arabian blacklist of Jewish firms and declared:

"At the Saudi Arabian Consulate in the Chrysler Building, a trade attaché admitted that American firms either owned or headed

by Americans of the Jewish faith cannot do business with the Arab country."

Similarly, a report in the same newspaper on December 30, 1955, announced State Department disapproval of the exclusion of Jewish firms from this area of international trade and observed:

"An official of the Saudi Arabian Consulate in New York declined to confirm the report, but said that Saudi Arabian firms would 'naturally be reluctant to deal' with American businesses owned by Jews."

#### (2) The boycott becomes official

Moreover, evidence has come into the possession of the American Jewish Congress unmistakably establishing overt conduct, not on the part of private individuals, but by authorized representatives of the Saudi Arabian Government to promote, create, and maintain a boycott of American Jewish business firms. American Jewish exporters have separately filed affidavits with the American Jewish Congress declaring that the Saudi Arabian Consulate in New York City has refused to legalize commercial invoices they have submitted for approval on the grounds that they are "undesirable" concerns. And each of them has attested that he cannot account for this classification except for the intensive questioning that he or his representatives have recently undergone by members of the Consulate staff as to the fact of their Jewish ownership or as to their employment of Jewish personnel. Even the messengers employed by these firms merely to deliver and hand over papers have been interrogated about their religious affiliation. Under the existing custom of international trade the legalization of commercial invoices frequently is a prerequisite to the fulfillment of contractual obligations between American shippers and Arab purchasers. It will be noticed that in the letters quoted above demanding a certification of non-Jewish ownership, several Arab firms have referred to the fact that "according to Saudi Arabian Government regulations all invoices for the goods supplied must be legalized by the Saudi delegation of your side." A refusal by the Saudi Arabian Government, therefore, to validate these instruments precludes any possibility of maintaining commercial dealings by American Jewish exporters with their Arab customers.

None of the exporters affected by this ruling until this time had any difficulty or disagreement with the Arab Consulate in New York or with their Arab customers. Despite the generally understood disapproval by the Saudi Arabian Government of commercial transactions carried on by its nationals and foreign Jewish businesses, many of these exporters with the cooperation and help of Arab purchasers had been able to work out devices to avoid official intervention in their transactions. However, the boycott now imposed by Arab Government officials flatly precludes any possibility of negotiation or cooperation on the part of private individuals of either country to carry out contracts for trade. It is precisely because this ban is conducted under the auspices of the Arabian governments themselves and not as a result of private individual decision that these American citizens are barred. It is no longer possible to attempt to evade this problem by lightly passing it off as a result of individual misreading of official regulations. This anti-Jewish discrimination stands clearly disclosed as the direct result of official governmental decision and decree.

Moreover, it is indisputable that our own Government by now must be aware that the current Saudi Arabian boycott of Jewish firms is, in fact, an official undertaking and an expression of anti-Semitic prejudice by the Saudi Arabian Government itself, and not merely a succession of sporadic, private acts. The following item appearing on page 7 of the Foreign Commerce Weekly

of March 5, 1956, published in Washington by the United States Department of Commerce establishes that the Department of Commerce, if not the State Department, is fully apprised of the facts:

"Saudi Arabia intends to boycott all Jewish or Jewish-directed firms from trading with that country, according to information received by the Bureau of Foreign Commerce.

"This new policy greatly extends the provisions of the existing boycott against firms having branches, assembly plants, or general agents in Israel, as well as firms having shares in Israeli companies.

"Implementation of the new policy normally will be accomplished by Saudi Arabian Consulates, who are responsible for legalization of commercial invoices and certificates of origin."

Similarly, the Minutes of the Monthly Round Table Conference of the Foreign Credit Interchange Bureau of March 7, 1956, discloses that Mr. Milton Blecher, Business Analyst of the New York Field Office of the United States Department of Commerce was among the discussants at the conference and that the following comments on the Saudi Arabian boycott were made:

"CHAIRMAN. Customers in Saudi Arabia have advised that a certificate is required by the Saudi Arabian authorities as to the Jewish or Christian status of the firm for which a letter of credit is to be opened. Such a certificate is to be verified or visaed by the Saudi Arabian Consul in New York. Lack of this certificate, or a certificate indicating that the supplier firm is 'Jewish' would make it impossible to conclude the sale. It is not clear just what is meant by a 'Jewish firm' nor can we comply with such a request without protesting the implication. Has there been any action by the Department of Commerce or by the FCIB to make the impertinence of this requirement known to the Saudi-Arabian authorities?

"Mr. MILTON BLECHER (United States Department of Commerce). Saudi Arabia intends to boycott all Jewish or Jewish-directed firms from trading with that country, according to information received by the Bureau of Foreign Commerce, United States Department of Commerce.

"This new policy greatly extends the provisions of the existing boycott against firms having branches, assembly plants, or general agents in Israel, as well as firms having shares in Israeli companies.

"Implementation of the new policy normally will be accomplished by Saudi Arabian consulates, who are responsible for legalization of commercial invoices and certificates of origin.

"CHAIRMAN. I think Mr. Blecher in his comments also answered question No. 2.

"Question: Several stories have appeared recently in the press regarding a trading boycott by Saudi Arabia against certain American firms. Can you develop this further at the Round Table?

"MEMBER. One part of the discussion has not been clarified. Is this something being considered or are there firms now shipping to Saudi Arabia and having any difficulty?

"PANEL MEMBER. I just heard of one case where the consulate in Beirut refused to clear the transshipment documents.

"MEMBER. Within the last month we received a letter of credit from Saudi Arabia and there was absolutely no question.

"PANEL MEMBER. I think there is a private clearance going on here by the consulate and they have certain information on certain firms on the strength of which they act.

"MEMBER. We have made several shipments and all that has been required of us has been certificate of origin and that would be legalized by the Saudi Arabian consulate.

"MEMBER. What would be considered a Jewish corporation?

"CHAIRMAN. Can anybody answer that?

"PANEL MEMBER. As far as I know if any member of the firm or part owner of the firm is of the Jewish faith they will not allow the goods in."

The Department of Commerce is thus aware of the facts. Foreign creditmen working in this country are aware of the facts. Virtually the only interested party not aware of the facts is our State Department.

In the one precedent in our history for this withholding of consular approval of commercial documents submitted by American Jewish firms, the then Acting Secretary of State, Alvey A. Adee, in 1895 found this practice to be an "unjust and invidious discrimination against American Jews":

"But the Russian discrimination against American Jews is not confined simply to the matter of vising passports. This department was informed a few years since by the Russian Minister here that Russian consuls in this country would refuse authentication to legal documents for use in Russia when Jews are ascertained to be interested. This is an unjust and invidious discrimination against American Jews" (Foreign Relations, 1895, page 1067).

Acting Secretary Adee called for immediate cessation of these practices and the adoption of preventive measures by this country. It is to be expected that now that all pretense has been dropped and the actual involvement of Government officials in the current anti-Jewish boycott is a matter of full public disclosure and information, our State Department officials will similarly be disposed to demand an immediate stop to this intolerable behavior by Arab diplomats in this country.

It is also significant that none of these exporters maintains any branches or transacts any business with the Government of Israel or with any Israeli firms. The allegation that only firms with Israeli branches or connections are excluded from Arab trade is a transparent artifice employed by the Arab League to conceal its intention to boycott Jewish firms wherever situated, as is indicated in the remarks of Mr. Blecher, of the United States Department of Commerce, quoted earlier. It cannot be mere accident that so many individual Arab exporters should have felt constrained to interpret nominally anti-Israel regulations as, in fact, directed against any foreign Jewish enterprise. The merits of Arab hostility to Israel may be debated by other disinterested nations, but this hostility cannot in any way be made to justify the current campaign of universal anti-Semitism.

It is worth noting that in some countries, notably Italy and Holland, commercial organizations and Government authorities have denounced this Arab policy and have refused to cooperate with it. The Central Organization for Foreign Economic Relations at the Hague has recently advised the Netherlands branch of the International Chamber of Commerce that Dutch members should not supply information relating to the number of Jewish executives and employees employed in Dutch export houses as demanded by various Arab importers. It is also disclosed that: "The Belgian Foreign Ministry is reported to have told the Antwerp association that it is giving sympathetic consideration to the request for international action on the issue" (New York Herald Tribune, February 12, 1956).

(3) The "informal approach" of the State Department

No less should be expected of our own Government. Previous State Department demurrers on the ground that the Arab states have the sovereign right to regulate their commerce and their mode of international dealing are not a sufficient reply to the deprivation of rights suffered by American citizens. The operative facts here do not run to any country's sovereignty, but rather to

our own country's policy of permitting an affront to a section of American citizenry to go unanswered.

Moreover, the State Department surely has a responsibility to reaffirm and continually press, through every possible international forum its wholehearted opposition to this practice. As Senator LEHMAN wrote Secretary Dulles on January 25:

"Would you not agree that our Government has an obligation to its citizens, and its own ideals, to let the Government of Saudi Arabia know not only on one occasion but on repeated occasions that we view with utmost distaste this policy of anti-Semitic discrimination?"

It has been already noted that the State Department at one time felt that its intercession had successfully resulted in ending the then conceded official Arab boycott against American Jewish citizens. Recent events obviously disprove this claim. Part of the reason for our Government's notable lack of ability to bring this practice to a decisive end may be found in the hesitant and uncertain attitude of the State Department itself. It will be remembered from Mr. McFall's letter quoted earlier that the State Department was apprehensive about possible repercussions at least as much as it was agitated about the admitted fact of discrimination. Mr. McFall's language is suggestive of the State Department's thinking: "The delicacy of the problem in Saudi Arabia recommended an informal approach rather than official representations to that Government." And the State Department's notion of what needed to be done culminated in holding frank but friendly discussions.

It is high time the State Department steeled itself to the realization that informal approaches and friendly discussions, however frank, are not enough to drive home the proposition that this Government will not stand for further religious discrimination against its citizens. The fact that the agreement not to boycott did not stick must be attributed to the willingness of our representatives to pussyfoot and equivocate and to act out of fear of loss of advantage rather than out of strength deriving from conviction. Further representations can and ought to be made, but they must be made in firm language and in a formal context that makes it plain that we do not intend to be bought off; that, in short, we are determined with all the vigor and influence we can bring to bear to protect all our citizens alike. It should be made plain that no treaty or trade agreement will be negotiated or maintained between the Arab countries and the United States unless it is expressly understood that all American citizens shall have full and equal right to participate in the trade thus made possible, without regard to religious affiliation. The prestige and influence of the United States is not so inconsiderable that the Arab countries could easily remain recalcitrant and unyielding in the face of a clear and determined expression of policy by this country.

#### IV. ARAB ANTI-JEWISH PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Perhaps the most vicious offense committed by Arab governments against Jewish citizens in the United States is their deliberate fomenting of domestic anti-Semitism in this country and their collaboration with and sponsorship of elements in the American hate movement.

##### A. The Arab Information Center

Prior to the end of World War II, there were virtually no Arab propaganda activities at all in the United States. In November 1944, for the first time an office was established in New York under the name of the Institute of Arab-American Affairs to disseminate material about each of the Arab

countries separately as well as about the group of Arab countries united in the Arab League. Though its declared purpose was to seek to implement its policy as a medium of good will between the United States and Arab countries, most of its activities were concerned with the fight against the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine and by 1947 the Institute of Arab-American Affairs was dealing exclusively with the Palestine question.

The main organ of propaganda for the Arabs in the United States is the Arab Information Center recently reactivated in New York City at 445 Park Avenue, where it shares quarters with the U. N. delegation of the Kingdom of Yemen. The information center is currently headed by Kamil Abdul Rahim, a veteran diplomat who served from 1948 to 1953 as Egyptian Ambassador to Washington and is now an accredited member, with the rank of Ambassador, of the Yemen delegation to the U. N. As U. N. Ambassador, Rahim enjoys diplomatic immunity not only for his own person but also for the premises he occupies, which just happen to be coterminous with those of the Arab Information Center. The center itself, however, is registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. The center has recently been granted a special fund of \$300,000 to expand its activities against Israel and Zionism. Egypt underwrote the major portion of this expenditure with an allocation of \$140,000; the Arab League allotted \$90,000, and Saudi Arabia \$70,000. Besides this, the center has been given a regular budget of \$400,000. Thus, it has a total of \$700,000 to expend in the coming year's operations.

#### B. Collaboration with American hatemongers

In carrying out its anti-Jewish campaign, the Arab Information Center has determined upon a course of intimate cooperation with professional anti-Semites in this country.

A policy statement sent by Rahim on October 25, 1954, from Cairo before his departure for the United States to head the center, to Dr. Omar Haliq, Arab League representative in New York (Jewish Telegraphic Agency dispatch of March 17, 1955) declared that the center henceforth would welcome the cooperation and assistance of professional anti-Semites in all fields and ways. Rahim emphasized that such activities were to be handled discreetly so as not to expose the center to charges of anti-Semitism or compromise its character as a cultural exchange. Rahim indicated that he intended to deal with this facet of the center's activities personally.

It is further reported that at about this same time Dr. Haliq sounded out for possible Arab collaboration such figures as Gerald L. K. Smith, who runs the Christian Nationalist Party; Joseph P. Kamp, head of the Constitutional Educational League; Allen Zoll, whose American Patriots, Inc., was listed as fascist by the Justice Department; and Benjamin H. Freedman, confessed financier of anti-Jewish publications.

More recently open cooperation between Arab diplomats and American hate groups has become even more bold and unabashed. At a meeting last June of the American Nationalist Coalition, a front group for James H. Madole's National Renaissance Party, cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as an avowedly Hitlerite group, Abdul M. Hassan, a member of the Egyptian delegation to the United Nations, was a featured and inflammatory speaker. A table at the rear of the meeting room, attended by a uniformed American Nationalist Coalition youth member, offered for free distribution such pamphlets as Egypt's Agrarian Policy Under the New Regime, by Dr. Abd-El-Razzok Sidky, and the Story of Zionist Espionage in Egypt. According to Madole,

the pamphlets were provided free by the Egyptian Embassy and proved the anti-Israel and anti-Jewish charges made in Hassan's remarks. Hassan inevitably later declared that his appearance at the meeting did not necessarily constitute endorsement of the coalition's entire program. National Jewish Post, June 10, 1955.

#### C. Distribution of anti-Semitic literature

The increasing voluminous literature published directly by Arab official propaganda agencies bears a comparable stamp of anti-Jewishness although, significantly, it does not usually bear any imprint identifying its source. Most of the anti-Jewish items now being freely distributed across the country, often elaborately and handsomely printed, are published by the embassies of the Arab states and distributed by the Arab Information Center.

Generally, Arab officials obey the advice given them by American consultants to avoid heavy-handed anti-Jewish themes in their propaganda. On the other hand, the Arabs understand that the terms "Zionist" and "Jew" are so closely identified in the United States by the general public that the theme of anti-Zionism can be handled adroitly to produce anti-Jewish implications, thus the continually repeated refrain concerning "the influence of the American Zionists in Washington."

Occasionally, however, the Arab line is directed into an unmistakable excursion into overt anti-Jewish incitement. This is especially true in two pamphlets now widely in circulation, *Story of Zionist Espionage in Egypt and Jewish Atrocities in the Holy Land*. Both documents originally were issued by the Egyptian Embassy and were sent without any indication of their source or sponsorship to a large mailing list. They are also distributed by the Arab Information Center. These pamphlets clearly seek not only to inspire antipathy toward Israel but, in addition, to invoke a feeling of anti-Jewish prejudice and bias generally. And as a matter of fact, domestic anti-Semites in the United States already has distributed and exploited these documents for their own purposes. Thus, *The Story of Zionist Espionage in Egypt* is now being circulated by Madole's National Renaissance Party, an openly Hitlerite group, and *Jewish Atrocities in the Holy Land*, published 6 years ago, has been circulated and distributed, and its contents otherwise exploited, by such worthies as Conde McGinley, Gerald L. K. Smith, and Frank L. Britton.

*The Story of Zionist Espionage in Egypt* is openly anti-Jewish as well as anti-Israel. A detailed narration of an alleged spy plot is prefaced with the statement that the Israelis—

"Recruit hundreds of agents, financed through the international system of begging which Israel has invented and brought to an art, and disperse them throughout the Arab world to commit acts of sabotage, destroying the lives of the innocent."

After 40 pages on this subject, the pamphlet then devotes about 15 pages to alleged desecration of Moslem and Christian holy places by the Zionist and the Jewish forces, narrations of the assassinations of Lord Moyne and Count Bernadotte, and finally—after this lengthy warm-up of spying, bombing, atrocity, desecration and assassination—a one-page dissertation on Zionism and communism, which begins:

"Zionism and communism are two distinctive forces with one political objective—world domination. Both powers cooperate secretly and in public without friction since the power in the end will eventually go to Zionism."

"\* \* \* They will not achieve supremacy until they destroy the Islamic and Christian countries all over the world. Therefore com-

munist helps Zionism and each in its own way completes the other; only thus will they reach their aim—Zionist world supremacy."

Jewish Atrocities in the Holy Land exploits the excesses committed by unauthorized terrorists at the height of the Arab-Israeli conflict; the excesses are attributed to the Jews as Jews. Scattered throughout the pamphlet are photographs of the more revolting kind, including some which show dead victims in various states of decomposition.

The following excerpts are illustrative of the themes in the text of this pamphlet:

"Now we have once more to hear the horrible tale of sadistic cruelties and wanton brutalities perpetrated against an innocent population, mainly composed of women, children and old men. But this time the aggressors are those very Jews who were lately so loud in their outcry against the Nazis."

"\* \* \* When reading of these atrocious acts, one unconsciously thinks of their perpetrators as being untaught savages, or barbarians of the remote past. Yet these same Jews have for centuries, by virtue of their money-amassing activities, gathered to themselves the cream of culture, and refinement of whatever country they have settled in. The wealthy, educated Jew surrounded by all the culture and art that his riches can command has long been a familiar figure in civilized society."

An even more outrageous document, published by the World Truth League of POB 44, Jerusalem, Jordan-Arab side, is distributed widely in the United States through embassy offices of the Arab delegations to the U. N. as well as by the Arab Information Center. The sheet, composed in a sensational format, contains touched-up photographs of alleged Israeli massacres of Arab children, old men, and women. It quotes liberally from the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion to the effect that the Jews believe the gentiles are a flock of sheep and we are the wolves and you know what happens when the wolves get hold of the flock. This Jordanian leaflet maintains that Jews, not Israelis, are the unconscionable exploiters of the gentile world and they have very well proved it once again by their recent Judaic barbarities against innocent Arab shepherds. It declares that the basic material in all Jewish propaganda is composed of lies and distortion of facts as is known by now all over the world.

Another column contains citations from books and documents written by Jews of various nationalities around the world, purporting to illustrate the Jewish incendiary revolutionary spirit. Among the persons slandered are: Theodore Herzl, Louis Dembitz Brandeis, Harold Laski, and Bernard Baruch. The paper also discloses that: "Benjamin Cohen, a Jew from Chile, is just under Trygve Lie, the U. N. Secretary General and his job is to see that Lie follows the Jew plan." "The United States representative at the U. N. is the Jew, Ernest A. Gross." "Dr. Leo Paslovsky, 'special United States Assistant Secretary of State,' a Russian born Jew, naturalized American citizen, is the man who drew the United Nations Charter, with the assistance of Alger Hiss, the traitor, who was then in the State Department." "The United States is hopelessly run by Jews and the U. N. is the den of Jewish spies."

It is apparent that crude and vicious canards of this kind are not intended to be limited merely to incitement of hostility against Israel. They are designed for the larger purpose of promoting hatred toward Jews of every national allegiance throughout the world.

#### D. Defamation by Arab diplomats

The most astounding and arrogant conduct of all however is the persistent abuse

by Arab diplomats of the hospitality granted them by the United States. In addition to the spurious political arguments used by Arab diplomatic representatives to press their cause, they have now added an almost open appeal to prejudice, suspicion, and race hate. Recourse to anti-Semitism is nothing new in the history of calumny of the Jewish people but it never before has been attempted in America by foreign diplomats as part of a calculated design.

One of the first reported cases of an attack by Arab spokesmen on American Jews before their fellow citizens occurred in February 1953 during a conference of middle eastern affairs sponsored by the Foreign Service Educational Foundation in Washington, for the benefit of corporations from all over the country. During the conference, a State Department official read an address by Mr. Bakr, then Iraq Chargé d'Affairs in Washington and now his country's Foreign Secretary, in which Bakr used the then recent doctors' plot of Moscow to show that Jews could really not be trusted anywhere and that they are part of an international conspiracy, whether they are Russian citizens, Americans or citizens of any other country.

(1) Ambassador Zeineddin's Anti-Jewish Campaign

Dr. Zeineddin, Bakr's Syrian colleague, tried out this theme a month later in an address at the University of Vermont and then later in a full-fledged attack on April 15, 1953, at the Seventh Session of the United Nations in New York.

In his address, the Syrian Ambassador stated:

"The steps taken by the Soviet Union were met with deep satisfaction and appreciation in my country and the public opinion of other Middle Eastern countries \* \* \* Zionism uses the Jewish religion for its political purposes \* \* \* Jews who become Zionists act as a separate closely knit group within their nation. They serve their own Zionist interest. Their allegiance is therefore not to their legal country. Their allegiance to their legal country is formal and not real. Their real allegiance would be to Zionism and Israel, i. e., to a foreign authority. An American, an Argentinian, a Russian, or a Syrian Zionist are all one in furthering the aims of Zionism in Israel, be it to the detriment of the interests of their legal country. This, naturally, creates mistrust, suspicion, and apprehension between Zionist Jews and non-Jews. Thus Zionism breeds and enhances the growth of anti-Semitism. In fact everywhere that Zionism grew, it brought anti-Semitism in its wake."

After piously insisting that he is not anti-Semitic ("How can we Arabs be anti-Semitic? Are we not Semites ourselves?"). Dr. Zeineddin repeated the familiar calumny of the "international Zionist conspiracy" in the following remarks:

"Zionists today are organized all over the world \* \* \* they join political parties ranging from diehard conservatism to communism, but as Zionists they work toward one end \* \* \* Zionism works in a way which constantly adversely affects world peace and the security of other states by inciting the Jews to feel that they are exiles in their various homelands and by developing in them a conviction that they are an entity of their own in any country. It breaches, with one stroke, the national unity in their country on the basis of religion, thus diminishing national harmony."

These remarks have formed a consistent pattern. Thus, Zeineddin has declared over a radio program broadcast over the NBC network:

"As you may know, Zionism is based upon a distinction as to race and religion between

the Jew and gentile. They (Zionists) attempt to have the Jews consider themselves as exiles in other countries \* \* \* and there you have the idea of the diaspora \* \* \* and that they should be assembled in Palestine. A Zionist, therefore, gets to be loyal to Israel and gets to be loyal to the Zionist movement if he is really a Zionist. His loyalty to Zionism undoubtedly may diminish his loyalty to the country in which he lives, and therefore Zionism brings some shade of doubt as to the loyalty of Jews in other countries of whom many might be loyal."

Similarly in a television broadcast some time later, carried over the Dumont network on November 2, 1953, he stated further:

"When an individual becomes a Zionist he acquires a double loyalty, his allegiance is divided. If he is a strong Zionist, his allegiance will certainly go to Israel, even against his very own country, be it the United States, or Syria, or any other country. He is then legally an American, but in fact his allegiance is due to some other principle, that of Zionism, or to some other country such as Israel."

Far from abating, Dr. Zeineddin's incitement of domestic anti-Semitism has become an increasingly intense preoccupation. In a speech delivered before the Women's National Democratic Club in Washington in November 1955 he brazenly impugned the loyalty of American Jews to their own country. Zeineddin charged that "Zionist pressures" on the United States Government and Zionist propaganda had distorted and perverted Arab and American relations. He characterized Jews throughout the world as "mongrelized Russians" who cannot ever claim to be an integral part of a country in which they reside, that they consider themselves "different," that they refuse to assimilate and owe their allegiance solely to international Zionism. He wound up his speech by declaring that if there is such a large and urgent sentiment in this country for a creation of a Jewish state "then the only fit place for them is New York City" (New York Post, November 16, 1955).

On November 17, 1955, in a lengthy meeting with George V. Allen, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, Zeineddin boasts of having said that: "Zionism seeks with some success to make of the United States and in the United States a center for its worldwide activity which is inimical to other states and which is morally unfounded." Zeineddin reportedly urged that the United States "find it fit to look into this matter in view of its international implications." He stressed that the Arabs were especially anxious to see the United States Government look into tax exemptions by Jewish charity contributors. He claimed such deductions really supported "a foreign political movement" (Jewish Telegraph Agency, November 18, 1955).

A similar refrain has recently been picked up by the diplomatic representatives of other Arab countries. In an address to the Economic Club of Detroit on October 31, 1955, Dr. Mohamed Fadhil Al-Jamali, Foreign Minister of Iraq and head of its U. N. delegation described the situation "created by a United States policy which has been inspired mainly by Zionist propaganda and pressure":

"They (the Arabs) feel that American policy cannot easily relieve itself from Zionist pressure and Zionist manipulation of the Jewish vote. Next year is an election year. Could the peoples of the United States who have peace and American interests at heart see to it that Zionist propaganda becomes ineffective in the election campaign? It is most important for United States interests in the Middle East that United States policy should not be influenced by Zionist pressure."

The canards currently being circulated by Arab diplomats have not gone unnoticed and they have not been condemned only within the Jewish community. The leaders of five prominent non-Jewish nationality groups in America, including the president of the Czechoslovak National Council of America, the director of the American Hungarian Federation, the chairman of the National Anti-Defamation Committee of the Order of the Sons of Italy in the United States, the director of the American Lithuanian Information Center, the executive secretary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee and the editor of the leading Polish language newspaper in the United States, recently protested to Secretary of State Dulles against Zeineddin's libels. They wrote, "To us, the substance of the Ambassador's remarks in many ways was virtually indistinguishable from Nazi racial theories which, within all our memories have brought about such ruin and loss to the world" (J. T. A. November 22, 1955).

(2) Recruiting Arab Student Propagandists

The anti-Semitic activities of the Arab diplomats have been supplemented by the more informal if no less intense propaganda efforts of Arab students now studying in the United States. Cairo radio broadcasts monitored in the United States report that the more than 2,000 Arab students in this country have been directed by the Arab League to assume an active role in the promotion of anti-Israel and anti-Jewish propaganda in this country. According to these broadcasts, Arab students have been supplied with anti-Zionist literature and have been instructed to deliver anti-Zionist lectures not only on campus but in the general communities outside the universities in which they study, and they have been directed to exert themselves to stimulate pro-Arab and anti-Jewish articles in the American press. The indefatigable efforts of the Arab League to exploit every possible resource to incite anti-Jewish feeling in this country is evidenced in the following item in the January 1956 Newsletter of the Arab Students Association at Columbia University:

"Arab Students Abroad To Defend Arabism. The secretary-general of the Arab League requested member states to furnish the League with the names of its nationals studying abroad. The secretariat intends to provide these students, wherever they may be, with information which will help them defend Arab interests."

The same Columbia University Newsletter includes samples of the materials to be used as factual information by Arab students invited to college forums and other public meetings. A characteristic example is the following item attributed by the newsletter to the Egyptian weekly Al Musawwar:

"We Egyptians do not face a small country called Israel, but a well-organized international movement called Zionism. This movement exerts tremendous pressure on the Governments of the United States, France, England, and other Western countries."

"Some Western and Eastern bloc countries supplied Israel with arms during the 1947 conflict. Certain army generals, fliers, and soldiers who fought for Israel were not Jews; identification cards of prisoners taken during that war testify to that."

"Israel was established upon the bodies of Palestine's rightful inhabitants through funds obtained from the pockets of American, British, and French Zionists."

The Arab League is careful not to miss a trick. It does not scruple at abusing the special status enjoyed in this country by diplomats and visiting students, and it does not hesitate to attempt to convert each of its nationals in the United States into an instrument for the promotion of anti-Israel

and anti-Jewish doctrine in this country. That such conduct is improper, that it violates the hospitality extended by the host state, that it is offensive to the beliefs and traditions of the people of the United States is apparently a matter of no concern.

#### V. RECOMMENDATIONS

While we recognize that the Government of the United States from time to time has expressed its passing disapproval of Arab anti-Jewish discrimination against American citizens, we submit that far more vigorous action is called for than until now has been forthcoming. American Jews have the right to expect their Government to protect their dignity and good name and their right to travel or engage in commerce abroad on an equal footing with their fellow citizens of other faiths. The effect of present Arab policy is not only to deny equal treatment to American citizens in Arab territories but to extend anti-Semitism into new and unexpected places here. The time is overdue for official American spokesmen to meet in-fringements by foreign states upon the rights of American citizens with decision, firmness, and a determination to protect American rights.

The argument that a firm protection of the rights of our Jewish citizens must be damaging to our economic interests is false and misleading. Arab leaders are if anything practical men. And Arab economic relations are based not upon sentiment but upon interest. Any concessions that may now be enjoyed by the United States in Arab lands do not derive from any innate liking that Arab leaders have for this country or from their natural sympathy for our democratic objectives. These benefits result more simply from the enormous consideration that the United States is able to pay in return. It is incredible that this immense American revenue, absolutely vital to the support of the Arab economy will be refused because of our insistence upon equal treatment for all our citizens. Sovereign decisions on economic and political matters are not made to turn solely upon such factors.

American spokesmen appear sometimes to misunderstand our role. Our relations with the Arab States are not those in which we entreat their favor. We come with gifts in our hands amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars a year and Arab statesmen perceive this truth, perhaps more clearly and accurately than our own. If the Arab governments have felt during the past decade that they could ignore the protests of American ministers and Secretaries of State, it is because and only because they felt American protests were halfhearted and unwilling and because they were convinced that this Government spoke only for some special interests or for some special point of view. The intolerable abuse of American citizens by Arab States will be corrected just as quickly as they become convinced that for this country it is indeed intolerable.

The action necessary by the United States to convince the Arab governments of our determination and resolve to protect the rights of all our citizens equally can readily be prescribed. It would quickly be achieved by adoption of the following measures:

1. No treaty or trade agreement should be negotiated between the Arab countries and the United States unless it is stipulated that all American citizens shall have full and equal right to participate in the trade thus made possible, without regard to religious affiliation.

2. No contract should be negotiated with the Arab States by any agency of the United States whether it be for defense, security, or for any other reason, that allows or requires American Jews to be excluded from employment pursuant to its terms. It shall be made a part of each American-Arab agree-

ment that there shall be no religious discrimination as a result of these joint undertakings against any American citizens.

3. Existing American subsidies including those granted under the International Wheat Trade Agreement should be discontinued for trade in Arab countries unless it is explicitly understood that American Jews shall be permitted full participation without prejudice because of their religious beliefs.

4. No agency of this Government, military or diplomatic, should be permitted to consider religious affiliation in selecting personnel for assignment to Arab countries.

5. No discriminatory hiring practices should be condoned or excused because of the possible exclusion of Jews from Arab lands by Arab refusal to issue necessary visas.

6. The United States should prohibit immigration whether temporary or permanent, whether for tourists or for permanent residents, from any Arab State which bars entry to any American citizen because of his religious beliefs.

7. Any member of a diplomatic mission to this country who indulges in public anti-Jewish activities aimed directly or indirectly against American Jewish citizens or the American Jewish community generally should be declared *persona non grata* by our Government.

8. Any member of a diplomatic mission to this country who refuses to process commercial or legal documents because they are offered by Jewish business firms or who makes inquiries into the religious affiliation of persons who come before him in his official capacity should be declared *persona non grata*.

9. Any person present in the United States on a student visa who engages in public anti-Jewish activities aimed at American citizens should have his student visa terminated, since even the most permissive view of academic freedom cannot justify the promotion of race hatred.

10. The United States delegation to the United Nations should assume the initiative in demanding U. N. inquiry into practices of Arab States that are violative of the common pledge of all U. N. member states to promote universal respect for human rights.

Each of the nine other measures may be initiated by unilateral action of the United States. The anti-Jewish efforts of Arab countries, however, have spilled over every national border and while the general refusal of the civilized world to give way to Arab prejudice is gratifying, the fact that no concerted effort has been made to meet it decisively must be regarded as a serious shortcoming. The time has come for an international effort to put an end to a policy which is damaging to international trade and causes loss and grave inconveniences to people of many nationalities. Under article 55 of the charter, the United Nations undertakes to promote "universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion" and under article 56, "all members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in article 55." These texts are susceptible to many and varying interpretations but to seek to reconcile them with a new and deliberate policy of discrimination on an international scale is to denude words of their meaning. The action of Saudi Arabia in instituting discriminatory commercial practices against groups of citizens distinguishable only by their religion in countries with which it enjoys normal diplomatic relations is manifestly irreconcilable with the principles and purposes of the United Nations as embodied in the preamble to the charter and in articles 55 and 56.

Whatever may be thought about the right of a government to practice or tolerate discrimination against its own nationals, the practice of discrimination against the citizens of other states is clearly not compatible with an undertaking to promote universal respect for human rights, to say nothing of the comity of nations. If this precedent is allowed to stand without challenge, and is imitated elsewhere, the international community would be exposed to a new and serious menace. The national economy of every country would be opened to the operation of officially sponsored influences dangerous to its welfare and hostile to its traditions.

#### CONCLUSION

Decisive action by the United States will clear the air. We may confidently expect that Arab governments will desist in their discriminatory practices once our position is indicated by unequivocal action. The arithmetic of advantage is plain. Arab leaders could not repudiate American support without the prospect of certain financial loss. Our serious insistence upon an end to discrimination would doubtless persuade Arab spokesmen acting out of an enlightened self-interest to discontinue their anti-Semitic conduct. In any event this is a risk we are fated to run. No honorable alternative exists. We respectfully disagree with Secretary Dulles that Arab affronts to American citizens must be suffered peaceably so that our nations may "get along together in a way that is to our mutual advantage." There can be no "mutual advantage" when one of the terms of the bargain requires that we condone and ratify religious bigotry. We believe, as President Wilson believed in a comparable situation, there comes a time—and that time is now—when we must finally say: the price is too great.

ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN,  
President, American Jewish Congress.  
PHILIP BAUM,  
WILL MASLOW,  
Of Counsel.

APRIL 1956.

#### SPECIAL STUDIES OF SICKNESS AND DISABILITY, AND SPECIAL REPORTS THEREOF

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3076) to provide for a continuing survey and special studies of sickness and disability in the United States, and for periodic reports of the results thereof, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "National Health Survey Act."

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(1) that the latest information on the number and relevant characteristics of persons in the country suffering from heart disease, cancer, diabetes, arthritis and rheumatism, and other diseases, injuries, and handicapping conditions is now seriously out of date; and

(2) that periodic inventories providing reasonably current information on these matters are urgently needed for purposes such as (A) appraisal of the true state of health of our population (including both adults and children), (B) adequate planning of any programs to improve their health, (C) research in the field of chronic diseases, and (D) measurement of the numbers of persons in the working ages so disabled as to be unable to perform gainful work.

(b) It is, therefore, the purpose of this act to provide (1) for a continuing survey and special studies to secure on a noncompulsory basis accurate and current statistical information on the amount, distribution, and effects of illness and disability in the United States and the services received for or because of such conditions; and (2) for studying methods and survey techniques for securing such statistical information, with a view toward their continuing improvement.

SEC. 3. Part A of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. ch. 6A) is amended by adding after section 304 the following new section:

"NATIONAL HEALTH SURVEYS AND STUDIES

"SEC. 305. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized (1) to make, by sampling or other appropriate means, surveys and special studies of the population of the United States to determine the extent of illness and disability and related information such as: (A) the number, age, sex, ability to work or engage in other activities, and occupation or activities of persons afflicted with chronic or other disease or injury or handicapping condition; (B) the type of disease or injury or handicapping condition of each person so afflicted; (C) the length of time that each such person has been prevented from carrying on his occupation or activities; (D) the amounts and types of services received for or because of such conditions; and (E) the economic and other impacts of such conditions; and (2) in connection therewith, to develop and test new or improved methods for obtaining current data on illness and disability and related information.

"(b) The Surgeon General is authorized, at appropriate intervals, to make available, through publications and otherwise, to any interested governmental or other public or private agencies, organizations, or groups, or to the public, the results of surveys or studies made pursuant to subsection (a).

"(c) For each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1956, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as the Congress may determine for carrying out the provisions of this section.

"(d) To assist in carrying out the provisions of this section the Surgeon General is authorized and directed to cooperate and consult with the Departments of Commerce and Labor and any other interested Federal Departments or agencies and with State health departments. For such purpose he shall utilize insofar as possible the services or facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, of any appropriate State or other public agency, and may, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, utilize the services or facilities of any private agency, organization, group, or individual, in accordance with written agreements between the head of such agency, organization, or group, or such individual, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Payment, if any, for such services or facilities shall be made in such amounts as may be provided in such agreement."

SEC. 4. Section 301 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. 241) is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (f), redesignating paragraph (g) as paragraph (h), and inserting immediately following paragraph (f) the following new paragraph:

"(g) Make available, to health officials, scientists, and appropriate public and other nonprofit institutions and organizations, technical advice and assistance on the application of statistical methods to experiments, studies, and surveys in health and medical fields; and".

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have consulted with the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and he has no objection to the House amendment. I have also consulted with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and that Department has no objection. Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

## FOREIGN POLICY

### III. A NEW LOOK AT DEFENSE

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, over the past years our defense policies and preparations, so far as we have had any, have been based on our experience with the last previous war. This is a general statement. It is not a completely fair description of defense history, for there have always been individuals and groups and at times large sections of our defense forces who have been imaginative and have tried to project the future into present preparation.

Whatever may have been the case in the past, it is not true today that our defense forces are preparing on the basis of World War II or the Korean war. The pace of invention and development has been so fast as to stimulate the imagination, make necessary an appraisal of new possibilities, and, in general, lead to a complete review of our means and policies of defense.

It is scarcely necessary to do more than list the new developments, beginning with the atomic bomb which was dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. This was followed by the hydrogen bomb exploded in the Bikini-Eniwetok area. More recently, our first air-dropped hydrogen bomb was exploded in the same area.

The development of these powerful weapons has put the emphasis on fast, heavy bombers for delivering them and on supersonic fighter planes for preventing their delivery on our own territory. This has emphasized the importance of the air arm in our forces. The expansion of this arm and of the defenses against air attack are our primary military concern. The most serious obstacle to further expansion seems to lie in obtaining flying personnel. This situation demands the best thought and effort of the Congress and the Defense Department.

Defense is also heavily dependent on early warning. We now have available the means, elaborate and expensive ones, to detect, track, and attack invading bombers. There is no such defense presently available either in the Western World or behind the curtain to detect and destroy the long-range missile.

At the present moment the most active development is in the field of missiles carrying atomic warheads. These may be either guided missiles which are presently available, medium-range ballistic missiles whose development is approaching successful ranges up to 1,500 miles

or thereabouts, or the long-range, intercontinental ballistic missiles still in the early stages of development. It is hoped that the latter will have a range of several thousand miles.

Meanwhile, the size of the explodable charge of the atomic bomb has been continuously reduced so that there is now available a whole family of tactical atomic weapons for delivery by plane, rocket, or artillery.

It is obvious that this arsenal of death does not fit into any previous strategic pattern. We are forced to think and plan anew. Along what lines should this thinking and planning be done?

It is not the function of Congress to define defense policies in the first place. That must be left to the administration, whether in its political or its strategic aspects. It is certainly within our responsibility to raise some of the questions which must be answered and to see that those questions are answered. That responsibility we are not justified in leaving passively with the administrative branch of our Government.

Among the questions to be raised are these:

First, so far as concerns Europe, is there any doubt that the war for which we must be prepared will be an atomic war? Is there any slightest possibility that there will arise there a war which will be primarily one between foot soldiers?

Until we have more persuasive information and argument than is at present available, we must conclude that the European war of the future, if any, will be an atomic war. We cannot help facing this conclusion with regret, but we must face the facts, and we must make sure that the people whom we represent in the Congress of the United States face these facts also.

But let us not be too sure. We may be deceiving ourselves in this matter. Perhaps the Soviet Government will accept the atomic stalemate and, expecting us to do likewise, will initiate an invasion of Western Europe along old-fashioned, ground-army lines, where their greatest strength lies. To forestall this development, we should at once announce that tactical atomic weapons will be employed by us on invading forces within the boundaries of any invaded nation. This atomic deterrent extends the atomic stalemate to land warfare, and is a vital part of our defense measures. The importance of this action can scarcely be overrated. I presented the case for this action before the Subcommittee on Disarmament on March 7 last.

In other respects neither the people nor the Government are facing the facts. It may confidently be expected that the primary military targets of invading bombers will be our strategic airfields. There would be an endeavor to put these airfields out of business as nearly simultaneously as possible, so that we would lack the means of reprisal. What we have not been doing is to disperse these strategic fields in areas of low population density so that there would be as little civilian loss of life as possible. There have been definite reasons for

this policy. It is expensive to provide the necessary facilities and amenities for a large military installation far from large towns and cities. We must not let that consideration guide any further expansion of our strategic airfields. Furthermore, as a part of the education of the public, there must be an earnest request, amounting to insistence, that for its own protection, industrial expansion must be spread over the countryside so that it presents no concentrated target for destruction by the enemy. The workman's automobile and improved highways make this possible. In large measure this is taking place for economic reasons. Strategic necessity emphasizes the economic trend.

But perhaps the military attack may be, in essence, a political one. The 1,500 mile range ballistic missile is probably a political weapon. The proposed intercontinental ballistic missile is certainly political, not military. The difference between political and military weapons is this: If a weapon cannot be accurately aimed at a military target, it is not a military weapon. If it can be delivered over vast distances and exploded in the general areas of centers of population, its principal use and effect is to spread terror. This use is not military but political.

It is conceivable that a potential enemy, discouraged by the slow processes of infiltration and subversion in Western Europe, might shift to a new strategy. It might make it known that it has successfully developed the 1,500-mile missile and that, in consequence, it holds in its power every capital and every industrial center in continental Europe and the British Isles. On the basis of this threat it might demand of the nations of Western Europe a complete reorientation away from freedom and toward the acceptance of Soviet power and Communist doctrine.

With this as a lively possibility, we must make it the main element of our policy to press forward with the launching platforms and the missile supplies in Western Europe which will counterbalance this threat and hold it in check. This contribution to the safety of our allies will be a main responsibility of the Army.

What about the Navy?

It would seem for the present and in the years ahead to have two primary functions. One of them is to keep the sea lanes open, and for this purpose it must be provided with the most advanced means of submarine spotting and submarine destruction and must likewise be able to detect and repel attack from the air. There is another mission, whether by surface ships or submarines, and that is to provide launching platforms for bomb-laden planes and particularly for guided and ballistic missiles. Such platforms can work from unexpected directions and can reach well within the lines of any hostile attacking nation.

What is the mission of the Marines?

The probabilities of trouble in South-eastern Asia are of a different sort from those in Europe. Experience in Korea and Indochina warns us of military in-

filtration supported by great reserves of enemy materiel and personnel. The ability to defend friendly areas and peoples against this warfare of military infiltration will depend on such a force in being as is represented by the Marines—a "force in being," with instant readiness of its air arm and sea arm. The reserve support comes from our land forces which will be deployed on occasion to form the present-day substitute for the impracticable permanent ring of steel about the great Communist heartland, which was our previous policy. This policy is now virtually discarded, as it must be, in favor of a more flexible, quick-striking means of defense and offense.

Finally, are the political aspects of defense growing in importance?

This question must be answered in the affirmative. The Geneva Conference marked a shift in Soviet policy toward a greater reliance on the political offensive. Having been convinced by our President that we had no intention or desire to attack behind the Iron Curtain—and the President spoke truly—this left the Soviet Government free to expand its political activity while maintaining its military strength. Since that date its change of front has been demonstrated in Burma, in India, in Afghanistan, in Egypt, and elsewhere on the face of the earth. The expansion and development of Soviet policy lie in the political field, while the Soviet Union continues to maintain and strengthen its military power.

Let it again be said that the ballistic missiles to which we are giving our most serious attention at this time cannot be, in their nature, military weapons at all. They cannot be delivered on precise military targets. The faster we press their development, the less accurate does their aiming become. They are by their nature an effective means for spreading terror, and only an inefficient means for attack on concentrations of military personnel, materiel, and production. In spite of anything that military development can do, the future of our defense deals primarily with political questions.

These facts and all the considerations previously set forth lead to the possibility that we can for a few years strengthen our defense without increasing our appropriations. This will result from the careful reappraisal which is now required. As against that possibility, we have to set the expense of converting our warships and our planes to atomic propulsion. This will be a tremendously expensive undertaking, but the burden of it will not fall heavily upon us in the next few years. There will be a breathing spell which we must use to expand our nonmilitary measures.

For we must recognize that there is no impregnable defense—no offense which can prevent attack. Doubling our defense billions would not bring safety. The delivery of a fraction of the presently available atomic megatons may determine the issue. Let us again listen to the words of Admiral Mahan:

The purpose of military power is to provide time for moral ideas to take root.

To this it may be added that the soil for moral ideas is found in the political field.

The possibility of coming to a favorable political conclusion remains. Further talks in this series will therefore, for the most part, be addressed to political considerations.

Mr. President, let me close with the earnest suggestion that the questions raised in this speech be considered by the administration. Let us be presented in the next Congress with a defense program which will have evidently taken these and related questions into consideration. Let us for the last time be offered a compromise of interservice disputes, and for the first time let us consider an integrated program.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there are now available the District of Columbia appropriation conference report and the conference report on the water-pollution control bill. Later in the day we shall have a conference report on the public-works bill, and I hope the conference report on the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill.

I now suggest to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] that he submit the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and ask for its immediate consideration.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10003) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate. The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 27, 1956, pp. 11115-11116, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a comparative summary table relating to appropriations included in the District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1957.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*District of Columbia appropriation bill, 1957 (H. R. 10003)—Comparative summary of bill*

Appropriations	Appropriation, 1956	Estimate, 1957	House bill	Senate bill	Conference bill
<b>OPERATING EXPENSES</b>					
Executive Office.....	\$365,500	\$330,800	\$323,000	\$323,000	\$323,000
Department of General Administration.....	3,350,250	3,528,000	3,425,000	3,475,000	3,475,000
Office of Corporation Counsel.....	407,300	483,000	480,000	480,000	480,000
Compensation and retirement fund expenses.....	10,476,000	11,165,400	11,100,000	11,100,000	11,100,000
Regulatory agencies.....	1,022,700	1,068,000	1,053,000	1,058,440	1,058,440
Department of Occupations and Professions.....	262,100	262,100	262,000	262,000	262,000
Public schools.....	31,302,000	32,008,000	32,130,800	32,590,750	32,515,750
Public Library.....	1,737,800	1,784,000	1,783,000	1,783,000	1,783,000
Recreation Department.....	1,787,500	1,903,000	1,892,000	1,903,000	1,903,000
Metropolitan Police.....	13,888,300	13,673,000	13,773,000	13,773,000	13,773,000
Metropolitan Police (additional municipal services, inaugural ceremonies).....		155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000
Fire Department.....	6,587,900	6,761,000	6,755,000	6,755,000	6,755,000
Veterans' Service Center.....	92,200	98,500	98,500	98,500	98,500
Office of Civil Defense.....	78,400	175,000	78,000	78,000	78,000
Department of Vocational Rehabilitation.....	140,000	147,400	147,000	147,000	147,000
Courts.....	3,814,674	3,974,500	3,972,000	3,972,000	3,972,000
Department of Public Health.....	25,005,800	25,334,000	25,434,000	25,503,400	25,503,400
Department of Corrections.....	4,671,820	4,729,000	4,710,000	4,710,000	4,710,000
Department of Public Welfare.....	10,147,800	10,675,000	10,642,500	10,642,500	10,642,500
Department of Buildings and Grounds.....	1,764,300	1,792,000	1,780,000	1,780,000	1,780,000
Office of the Surveyor.....	158,320	174,600	164,000	170,000	170,000
Department of Licenses and Inspections.....	1,600,276	1,676,000	1,640,000	1,658,000	1,658,000
Department of Highways.....	6,430,300	6,587,000	6,485,000	6,535,000	6,535,000
Department of Vehicles and Traffic.....	1,160,500	1,327,000	1,291,000	1,303,000	1,303,000
Motor-Vehicle Parking Agency.....	350,000	359,700	295,000	295,000	295,000
Department of Sanitary Engineering.....	10,409,500	10,900,000	10,846,000	10,896,200	10,896,200
Washington aqueduct.....	2,163,500	2,157,000	2,137,000	2,137,000	2,137,000
National Guard.....	125,000	136,700	128,500	136,500	136,500
National Capital Parks.....	2,484,000	2,539,000	2,535,000	2,535,000	2,535,000
National Zoological Park.....	690,900	725,000	720,000	720,000	720,000
Personal services, wage-scale employees.....	448,047				
<b>Total operating expenses:</b>					
General fund.....	129,190,669	131,899,191	131,603,170	131,799,229	132,224,229
Highway fund.....	7,377,467	7,620,625	7,521,094	7,565,025	7,565,025
Water fund.....	5,113,849	5,127,718	5,103,970	5,103,970	5,103,970
Sanitary sewage works fund.....	1,509,382	1,661,266	1,661,266	1,661,266	1,661,266
Motor-vehicle parking fund.....	395,600	410,500	345,800	345,800	345,800
<b>Grand total, operating expenses, all funds.....</b>	<b>143,586,967</b>	<b>146,719,300</b>	<b>146,235,300</b>	<b>146,975,290</b>	<b>146,900,290</b>
<b>CAPITAL OUTLAY</b>					
District debt service.....	443,800	394,500	394,500	394,500	394,500
Public building construction.....	7,544,400	6,311,700	5,200,000	6,221,700	6,221,700
Miscellaneous capital outlay.....	1,260,300				
Department of Highways.....	13,535,000	15,178,000	14,400,000	14,528,000	14,528,000
Department of Sanitary Engineering.....	9,662,000	10,526,000	10,068,000	10,068,000	10,068,000
Washington aqueduct.....	3,000,000	3,770,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
<b>Total, capital outlay:</b>					
General fund.....	13,865,700	6,360,700	5,299,000	6,320,700	6,320,700
Highway fund.....	13,135,000	15,428,000	14,600,000	14,728,000	14,728,000
Water fund.....	5,444,800	8,714,500	8,205,500	8,205,500	8,205,500
Sanitary sewage works fund.....	3,000,000	5,677,000	5,458,000	5,458,000	5,458,000
<b>Grand total, capital outlay, all funds.....</b>	<b>35,445,500</b>	<b>36,180,200</b>	<b>33,562,500</b>	<b>34,712,200</b>	<b>34,712,200</b>
<b>Recapitulation by funds:</b>					
General fund.....	143,056,399	138,259,891	136,902,170	138,119,929	138,544,929
Highway fund.....	20,512,467	23,048,625	22,121,094	22,293,025	22,293,025
Water fund.....	10,558,649	13,842,218	13,309,470	13,309,470	13,213,970
Sanitary sewage works fund.....	4,509,382	7,338,266	7,119,266	7,119,266	7,119,266
Motor-vehicle parking fund.....	395,600	410,500	345,800	345,800	345,800
<b>Total, all funds.....</b>	<b>179,032,497</b>	<b>182,899,500</b>	<b>179,797,800</b>	<b>181,087,490</b>	<b>181,612,490</b>

### EXTENSION OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 890) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report see House proceedings of June 27, 1956, pp. 11149-11154, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement with reference

to the conference report, for the benefit and information of the Senate.

The committee of conference of the two Houses met on Senate bill 890. The bill is designed to extend the Water Pollution Control Act—Public Law 845, 80th Congress—which terminates on June 30, 1956. The Water Pollution Control Act, enacted in 1948, was the first comprehensive legislation in this field. In the meantime, substantial progress has been made in the field of water pollution control, with more than half of the States having made improvements in their water pollution control laws, resulting in strengthened programs.

The conferees recognized that the pollution of water is a very serious problem, and that as our population increases and industry expands, we must take all steps possible to assure an adequate potable water supply for our Nation. Therefore, this proposed legislation is extremely important to the welfare of everyone, and will provide a basis for implementing and extending the work now under way.

The bill is designed to encourage the States to prepare comprehensive programs for water pollution control, and to urge upon them the enactment of uniform laws relating to water pollution control. It requires the Surgeon General to conduct and encourage and assist in coordinating research, investigations, and demonstrations, and to publish information relating to water pollution control.

The States would be given financial assistance in the conduct of their water pollution control programs, with \$3 million authorized annually for such assistance. There would also be authorized \$50 million annually, up to a total of \$500 million in the aggregate, for construction of treatment works. The Federal share would be limited to 30 percent of the total cost of each construction project, but not in excess of \$250,000. At least 50 percent of the funds authorized for construction grants would be for municipalities of 125,000 population or under.

A Water Pollution Control Advisory Board would be established, and would be made up of nine non-Federal members, appointed by the President, under the chairmanship of the Surgeon General.

The bill also includes provisions under which pollution of interstate waters having an interstate effect may be subject to Federal enforcement procedures. The provisions call for full consultation with States and interstate pollution control agencies prior to public hearing and subsequent court action. The court shall, in determining the order to be issued by it, give due consideration to the practicability and physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

#### WHICH NEWSPAPER DO YOU READ?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, of late, in reading various of the newspapers of the country, I have almost felt impelled to apologize to the Senate and to the members of the Press Galleries. In the light of the new Madison Avenue school of journalism, I feel as though I have masqueraded, during the past 6 years, as a former working member of the press.

For many years, Mr. President, I thought perhaps the Madison Avenue school of journalism, which recently has come into the ascendancy in many American newspapers, would be confined to the paid advertising sections of the newspapers.

I had read with interest advertisements extolling the virtues of character-building whisky and of health-giving cigarettes. In fact, I finally felt that the Madison Avenue school of journalism would arrive at the idea of combating the fear of cancer from cigarettes by means of publishing beautiful headlines with medical claims under the caption, "Cancer Is Good for You."

Mr. President, so completely have such advertisements led us to believe that white is black and black is white, that I find myself confused as regards my earlier newspaper training. I thought, since such statements appeared in the advertising sections, they should be regarded as nothing but advertising. But somehow or other, claims designed to lead one to arrive at strange deductions from certain advertising seems to have also spread like a virus to news columns of certain newspapers.

I am almost ready to turn in my Sigma Delta Chi key, send back my certificate of graduation from my school of journalism, surrender any claim on my part to having had training in journalism. In the new type of journalism I feel like a forgotten relic of the past, instead of a veteran of the city room of a newspaper.

If it is not too old-fashioned, Mr. President, permit me to be specific. Mr. President, I have been startled, astounded, and confused at the coverage by certain newspapers of the recent setback suffered by the Eisenhower admin-

istration in connection with the defeat administered to Governor Shivers, of Texas, by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Apparently in the minds of the members of the Democratic Convention, Governor Shivers' great sin was in leading Texas into the Eisenhower column in the last presidential election. Whether that had any significance in the repudiation of Governor Shivers by a majority of nearly 10 to 1 escaped the attention of most of the newspapers in their news articles. Possibly, just possibly, Shivers' advocacy of President Eisenhower might have had something to do with Governor Shivers' defeat as a Democratic leader.

Therefore, Mr. President, it was very interesting to read in the New York Herald Tribune an article based on the strange logic—ala the Madison Avenue school of journalism—that, after all, the victory of Senator JOHNSON of Texas was a victory for President Eisenhower. That logic seems to have worked in this way:

Senator JOHNSON of Texas is a moderate.

President Eisenhower is a moderate. Therefore, things equal to the same thing are equal to each other; and, therefore, the repudiation of Governor Shivers actually was an endorsement of Eisenhower.

Mr. President, as a result of such experiences, my faith and trust in the reliability of newspaper editing is getting low. Based on the motto instituted by E. W. Scripps: "Give light, and the people will find their way," my confidence in my judgment as an ex-newspaperman has begun to flicker, almost in the way that the flame of an old-fashioned tallow candle flickers. Perhaps I should say my newspaper lights have begun to grow as dim as the light from an old-fashioned kerosene lantern, as compared with the pitiless glare of a 5,000 candlepower Madison Avenue searchlight which can be turned on at will. Such has been my personal reaction as the public relations boys of Madison Avenue have started to warm up another great, significant political crusade.

Mr. President, it was rather significant to me that the day following the recent primary elections in Maryland, in which the votes cast by the Democrats for their nominee for President far exceeded in number the votes cast by Republicans for their presidential nominee, that in the Washington newspapers it was impossible to find a tabulation of the votes cast by the Democrats for the nominees of our great party.

On the other hand, the same newspapers seemed to find it quite significant, and worth a four-column headline, that in the State of Indiana, hundreds of miles away, the votes cast for the Republican presidential candidate far exceeded the number of votes cast for the Democratic nominee. Of course, Mr. President, perhaps such matters are merely coincidental, or perhaps they are a new part of modern journalism.

However, Mr. President, I think one of the most intriguing and interesting developments is to be observed in the

treatment given by different newspapers to the same story, as evidenced by certain articles published yesterday and today.

I now take pleasure in reading, for the information of the Senate, an article published this morning in the erudite Washington Post and Times Herald. The headline is "Moral Imperative—Mrs. Meyer Emphasizes Individuality."

The text of the article reads as follows:

Agnes E. Meyer said yesterday that the greatest need today is for individuals to develop their own highest possibilities because individuality is the core of freedom.

This was her message to graduates of New York City's High School of Music and Art, which her late brother, Frederick Ernst, was instrumental in founding when he was assistant superintendent of New York City schools.

"An interest in the self and in its development—in who you are and what you wish to become—is a legitimate passion at any time but today it is a moral imperative," the writer and educator said.

"In an age of conformity such as ours, it is one of the most civilizing influences that could be generated in our mass society."

The quest for selfhood, formerly the outstanding characteristic of Americans, now is threatened by the social isolation of the individual in our mass society, she said.

The wife of Eugene Meyer, chairman of the board of the Washington Post Co., continued that individuals must be free to seek the truth if liberalism, which is essential to democracy, is to regain its strength and produce unity out of diversity.

"The world is not merely the world," she concluded. "It is our world. And since we made it what it is today, we can remake it nearer to the heart's desire."

That is the Washington Post's coverage of a speech made by the wife of the owner of the Post—and she is a very distinguished person in her own right—before the graduating class of New York City's High School of Music and Art.

In that connection, Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fine things expressed in the account of her speech, as published in the Washington Post. But I wonder whether that coverage is in line with all the things I was taught about journalism, namely, that one is supposed to report the entire story, and that anything less than the whole story is only half a story or no story at all. In the Washington Daily News, published yesterday evening, I find the following headline and an article by the United Press, published under a New York date line, covering the same speech. It is as follows:

#### "HE FAILS TO WARN"—IKE CALLED UNINFORMED

NEW YORK, June 26.—Agnes E. Meyer charged today that President Eisenhower is the prisoner of a propaganda machine which has put false words in his mouth.

The same high-powered public-relations machine has so intimidated public opinion, she said, that it poses a serious threat to democratic government and freedom of thought.

Mrs. Meyer, wife of the chairman of the board of the Washington Post and Times Herald, spoke at graduation exercises at the High School of Music and Art.

The President has a constitutional duty to inform the people of the facts, however unpleasant, Mrs. Meyer said. "He has not lived up to this definition of the constitu-

tional role \* \* \* when he failed to warn the Nation that we are falling behind the Communists in our diplomacy, our armaments, and even in the education of sufficient scientists. \* \* \*

"President Eisenhower's cheerful disposition has its value, but not when, as is often the case, he tells the American people what they want to hear instead of the stern realities which they should hear. \* \* \* Obviously the President is not adequately informed by his assistants of the facts. For so honest a man would never stoop to deliberate distortion."

Mrs. Meyer said the silence of most United States newspapers "about this serious lapse in responsible leadership \* \* \* is but one of many indications that there is outright fear in this country of expressing any criticism of the President."

Meanwhile, the latest medical bulletin on Mr. Eisenhower issued by the White House said his weight is holding steady as he continues his satisfactory progress. Ike is expected to leave Walter Reed Hospital this weekend for a trip to his Gettysburg farm where he will celebrate his 40th wedding anniversary on Sunday.

I believe it might be wise to reprint the line which was often printed in the days when I used to be a newspaperman, many years ago. Often when an indignant country editor wrote a blistering editorial, he would conclude with the admonition, "city papers please copy."

I think it might be wise to repeat, for the benefit of the distinguished editors of the Washington Post and Times Herald, the last paragraph of the story.

Mrs. Meyer said the silence of most United States newspapers "about this mysterious lapse in responsible leadership \* \* \* is but one of many indications that there is outright fear in this country of expressing any criticism of the President."

Apparently the same lack of interest with respect to printing any uncomplimentary remarks about President Eisenhower in the speeches of Democratic Senators or other partisans extends, in this case, even to the speech of the distinguished wife of the chairman of the board of the Washington Post.

To one who used to be a newspaperman himself, such a wide divergence in the coverage of this event by two newspapers seems strange. I suppose it depends upon which newspaper one reads, when it comes to getting the entire picture.

I tried to call Mrs. Meyer, because I thought, from the wide divergence in coverage, that she might have made two speeches to the graduates, and that perhaps the Washington Post reporter was present at one, and the United Press reporter was present at the other. Unfortunately, Mrs. Meyer was out of the city, and I was unable to learn whether or not two speeches were delivered to the graduates.

At any rate, I think it is interesting to compare the two coverages of the same speech. They belong in the New Yorkers' "which newspaper do you read?" section.

#### NEED FOR CONTINUED AID FOR SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the very able reporter of the Watertown Daily Times, Alan S. Emory, has written an article entitled "Continued Aid Need

for Southeast Asia," which was published in that newspaper. It deals with the need for continued assistance in Southeast Asia, and especially Laos. It is the result of a conversation which Mr. Emory had with the able and hard working Mr. Yost, lately our Ambassador to the Kingdom of Laos, and now our Minister-designate to France.

I ask unanimous consent that this noteworthy article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### CONTINUED AID NEED FOR SOUTHEAST ASIA

(By Alan S. Emory)

WASHINGTON, June 9.—The retiring Ambassador to Laos said today continued military aid to the nations of southeast Asia was essential.

Charles W. Yost said in an interview that if the United States halted assistance to Indochina no one else could step into the breach.

Mr. Yost added, however, that Communist propaganda charging the United States with colonial aims was not having much effect in the area.

"The Hanoi radio broadcasts to Laos says the people there are just puppets of American imperialists," the former Watertown, N. Y., resident said. "This hasn't affected the government directly, but it has made officials sensitive to appearances. The United States representatives there are remaining very much in the background."

The Communist threat still looms in Laos, Mr. Yost declared.

"I am quite encouraged about the situation now," he said. "At the time of the division of Vietnam at the Geneva Conference the people were quite pessimistic. The country has very few developed resources and a small population for its size. There is a long, exposed frontier.

"The people have shown a great deal of resolution. They have continued to fight, even since Geneva, in two northern provinces against the Pathet Lao, the native Communists, and the Vietminh, the Red forces from Vietnam.

"By themselves the Laotian Communists couldn't hold out at all, they would collapse in a week. But they have help from North Vietnam."

Mr. Yost, who will leave about August 1 to become minister in the United States embassy in Paris, said Laotian Government soldiers were being supplied by air in the northern outposts. Wounded are evacuated by international commission helicopter. The only other route open is a jungle path.

"Laos needs both military and economic aid," he continued. "The government income just barely is adequate to cover civil services, let alone economic development or armed forces. The country has an army of about 25,000, which normally would be concerned with internal security. But about half of the army is tied up in the northern provinces."

The picture in southeast Asia has "definitely improved," according to the career diplomat. When he went to Laos 2 years ago fighting was widespread and United States help was confined to supporting the French and the Thais.

Then the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) was formed as "an umbrella over the area."

"This shows the Communists that if they make an overt move they will encounter united resistance," Mr. Yost commented, "and it limits them to internal subversion."

In the 2 years the envoy was in Laos the capital city of Vientiane grew from 20,000 population to 50,000 and the number of

United States employees there increased from 12 to 100, mostly economic technicians.

Few natives had any administrative training, he reported, and, while the men running the local government were good they were few in numbers and were desperate for foreign help.

Laos is not reached by the Voice of America, Mr. Yost related. There are few radios, although the Australian Government has a program of distributing sets and loudspeakers to villages.

The country has no single regular newspaper. The Government puts out a daily mimeographed bulletin, the diplomat said, and the political parties put out bulletins every 2 weeks.

It will be several years, he said, before Laos gets back to prewar footing in such fields as water, heat, trade, and roads. In addition to United States assistance, the French have an aid program, and help is forthcoming from the Colombo plan nations and the United Nations.

Living conditions for United States workers have just started to improve in what Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, called the roughest job in the Foreign Service.

The rundown condition of the Embassy there was so bad that stories resulting from Secretary of State John Foster Dulles' visit there last year startled people in this country. Now the Embassy has been cleaned up and replumbed, Mr. Yost reported.

He said he had hoped to break a bottle of champagne over the first prefabricated aluminum house to be constructed in the capital, but missed by about 2 weeks.

Mr. Yost's oldest son, Nicholas, is being graduated today from Hotchkiss School and will enter Princeton University this fall. Another son, Casimir, 11, attended school in South Vietnam at a place run by American missionaries, normally just for their own children. The Yosts also have a daughter, Felicity, 6.

#### HUMANE SLAUGHTERING OF ANIMALS FOR FOOD CONSUMPTION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in recent months there has been renewed interest in the subject of humane slaughtering of animals for food consumption. I have been extremely interested in this matter myself, and I recently appeared before the Senate Agriculture Committee in order to give my support to the Humphrey bill on this subject. In my judgment there has been considerable evidence proving the necessity for action against some of the cruel and wholly antiquated methods by which livestock and poultry are handled in certain meat-packing concerns.

I consider particularly pertinent two letters appearing in the New York Times of June 19, 1956, and in the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 26, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that these letters be printed in the body of the RECORD in order that others may have the opportunity to read them.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 19, 1956]

SLAUGHTERING LAWS URGED—HUMANE AND PRACTICAL METHODS ARE DECLARED AVAILABLE TO PACKERS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Twenty-seven years ago the meat-packing industry succeeded in making humanitarians believe that humane methods of slaughter would be voluntarily adopted by the

industry and that compulsory legislation was not necessary. To date only two major packers in this country have chosen to use humane methods.

In his letter published in the New York Times on June 5, the public-relations director of the American Meat Institute, Norman Draper, makes a bid for a still further extension of the 27 years and states flatly: "The meat-packing industry in the United States is using the most humane methods it knows of."

Of course, Mr. Draper knows of two more practical humane methods which are in everyday use in the plants of members of his organization: the captive-bolt pistol and the carbon-dioxide anesthetizing equipment; a third is the new stunning instrument to which he makes a vague reference.

However, he may not be too far wrong in his claim that the packing industry in general doesn't know of humane methods of slaughter. The trouble seems to be that, although literate in theory, packers do not even read their own trade papers. The prospect of educating them to voluntary humaneness is not, therefore, a very bright one.

#### MAGAZINE QUOTED

The National Provisioner, a leading meat-packing magazine, has been loyally supporting the American Meat Institute in its opposition to humane slaughter legislation. But in an editorial published June 2 the editor describes himself as "stunned by the apparent lack of knowledge on the part of a group of literate beef packers about a device and methods which have been described editorially and advertised in the National Provisioner and other publications for a decade."

Mr. Draper is incorrect when he claims that there is a country in Europe in which it is no longer compulsory to use electric current. No country has ever made it compulsory to use electric current for stunning animals. Most of the Western European democracies have compulsory humane slaughter laws. Denmark experienced difficulties with electric stunning and suspended their regulations for 1 year during a series of tests. The regulations are now in force again with the necessary specifications added.

Mr. Draper states that "when we find practical methods which actually are more humane and which can be used by all it will be a very easy matter to have these generally adopted." But the captive-bolt pistol, which is being used to stun many millions of animals every year and has been on the American market for more than a decade, is not even known to the group of "literate beef packers" mentioned above.

In no country have the majority of animals even been given a merciful death voluntarily. Legislation has always been necessary to obtain the use of humane methods by most meat packers. It must be enacted in the United States if we are to have standards as a humane nation and world leader which are equal to the standards of England, Scotland, Ireland, Holland, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, parts of Austria, Germany, France, and Australia, as well as New Zealand and Fiji. It is high time we took such action.

CHRISTINE STEVENS,

Secretary-Treasurer, Society for Animal Protective Legislation.

NEW YORK, June 12, 1956.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 26, 1956]

#### HUMANE SLAUGHTER

It was in the best tradition of the Washington Post and Times Herald that on June 19 you gave to Mr. Norman Draper, public relations director of the American Meat Institute, virtually a full column of space for criticism of your editorial indorsement of

S. 1636, H. R. 8540, and H. R. 9603, bills that would require packing plants to slaughter animals humanely. Mr. Draper abused your generosity and fairness, however, by being somewhat less than frank about the facts that have led to a strong public demand for the legislation that you have indorsed.

Mr. Draper says that it is not true that "cruelty is general practice in the meat-packing industry." The overwhelming weight of sworn testimony presented at a recent public hearing on S. 1636 contradicts Mr. Draper. It is almost universal practice in the American meat-packing industry to jerk hogs off the floor and upward by means of a chain shackled around one hind leg, then to stick the fully conscious animal in the throat with a knife, and allow the animal slowly to bleed to death.

The University of Minnesota recently reported that this technique is costing the packing industry millions of dollars every year because the frightened and agonized animals often cause severe bruises and tissue ruptures in frantic efforts to escape the shackle and hoist. More than 90 million hogs are subjected to this treatment every year in American packing plants.

Calves, sheep, and lambs undergo virtually the same suffering. Beef animals are commonly immobilized by being struck with a 5-pound sledge hammer. Studies both in the United States and in England show that an expert workman requires an average of more than 1.5 blows to pound an animal to the floor. I have myself seen steers hit with the hammer more than 10 times before they fell.

In many plants, in order to produce meat of certain qualities, steers weighing up to 1,200 pounds are shackled by one leg and hoisted in the air just as hogs are. It is common for steers so handled to suffer dislocated ankles, knees, and hips. All of this occurs while the animals are fully conscious. If this kind of treatment of animals be not cruelty, then Mr. Draper and I speak different languages.

Mr. Draper says that your editorial and an earlier letter published in your columns "make it appear that meat packers are opposed to humane slaughter legislation." The appearance certainly is not misleading, because Mr. Draper says in an immediately subsequent paragraph that "we do not believe that legislation of a compulsory and dictatorial nature offers an answer to a problem which is the cause of great concern within our own industry."

One can only suppose that Mr. Draper and the American Meat Institute would support humane slaughter legislation if it were not of a compulsory and dictatorial nature. It is in the nature of legislation, however, to be compulsory.

Mr. Draper says that "the meat-packing industry is using the most humane methods it knows of." Surely the meat-packing industry is not unaware that two of the largest packing plants in America are humanely anesthetizing all hogs with carbon dioxide before they are shackled, hoisted off the floor, or cut with a knife. The meat-packing industry certainly is not unaware that at least a dozen plants in the United States are using the completely humane captive-bolt pistol on cattle.

The fact is that both Mr. Draper and the American Meat Institute are fully aware that these humane techniques of slaughter are available, that they have been in use in a few plants in the United States and in hundreds of plants abroad for many years, and that they have been proved to be mechanically practical and economically advantageous.

It is a fact that an immense cruelty is being perpetrated in American slaughterhouses. It is a fact that the cruelty is unnecessary because humane methods of slaughter are available. It is a fact that these humane methods have been available for years, but

the great majority of packers have shown no inclination to adopt them.

It seems to the National Humane Society and many Americans, therefore, that there is reason for action by Congress.

FRED MYERS,  
Executive Director, the National Humane Society.

WASHINGTON.

#### MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 27, 1956, pp. 11116-11121, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to state to the Senate that the result of the conference was exceedingly satisfactory to the Senate conferees, and the report was signed by all of the Senate conferees. There was some compromising with reference to the Senate amendments, but that is the purpose of a conference.

The conference report provides an appropriation of \$856,727,000, which is \$15,459,000 below the amount approved by the Senate, and \$65,969,000 above the amount approved by the House.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a summary of the bill, showing how the money is to be distributed among the various titles. Title I embraces independent offices and provides funds for the Tennessee Valley Authority. Title II covers certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and title III covers civil functions, Department of the Army.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Public Works appropriation bill, fiscal year 1957—Bill summary

	Budget estimate, 1957	House allowance, 1957	Senate allowance	Conference allowance		Budget estimate, 1957	House allowance, 1957	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
<b>TITLE I—INDEPENDENT OFFICES</b>					<b>TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued</b>				
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	\$5,357,000	\$5,357,000	\$5,357,000	\$5,357,000	Bureau of Reclamation—Con. Operation and maintenance.....	\$27,267,000	\$26,500,000	\$27,267,000	\$27,267,000
Total, title I, independent offices.....	5,357,000	5,357,000	5,357,000	5,357,000	General administrative expenses.....	3,942,000	3,942,000	3,942,000	3,942,000
<b>TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR</b>					Total, Bureau of Reclamation.....				
Office of the Secretary: Southeastern Power Administration: Operation and maintenance.....	1,378,000	1,378,000	1,378,000	1,378,000	195,789,000	167,612,000	188,850,000	181,114,500	
Southwestern Power Administration: Operation and maintenance.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	Total, title II, Department of the Interior.....	224,267,000	196,090,000	217,328,000	209,592,500
Continuing fund <sup>1</sup> .....	6,400,000	6,400,000	6,400,000	6,400,000	<b>TITLE III—CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY</b>				
Total, Southwestern Power Administration.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	Quartermaster Corps: Cemeterial expenses.....	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,765,000	6,765,000
Bonneville Power Administration: Construction.....	18,700,000	18,700,000	18,700,000	18,700,000	Corps of Engineers: General investigations.....	<sup>2</sup> 7,035,000	8,122,000	9,322,000	9,322,000
Operation and maintenance.....	7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000	Construction.....	422,687,000	422,034,000	463,673,000	455,949,500
Total, Bonneville Power Administration.....	26,100,000	26,100,000	26,100,000	26,100,000	Operation and maintenance.....	85,900,000	85,900,000	95,900,000	95,900,000
Bureau of Reclamation: General investigations.....	5,680,000	5,270,000	5,680,000	5,680,000	General expenses.....	10,075,000	10,075,000	10,400,000	10,400,000
Construction and rehabilitation.....	150,900,000	125,900,000	138,961,000	131,225,500	Mississippi River and tributaries.....	56,030,000	56,030,000	62,791,000	62,791,000
Payment to Colorado River Basin fund.....	8,000,000	6,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000	Niagara remedial work.....	<sup>2</sup> 500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
					United States section, St. Lawrence Joint Board of Engineers.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
					Total, Corps of Engineers.....	<sup>2</sup> 582,377,000	582,811,000	642,736,000	635,012,500
					Total, title III, Department of the Army, civil functions.....	<sup>2</sup> 588,877,000	589,311,000	649,501,000	641,777,500
					Grand total, titles I, II, and III.....	818,501,000	790,758,000	872,186,000	856,727,000

<sup>1</sup> Limitation on the use of receipts not included in totals of this table.  
<sup>2</sup> Amount shown reflects amendment to the 1957 budget submitted by the President on Feb. 21, 1956, as follows:

	Original budget	Revised request
General investigations (flood control studies).....	\$1,650,000	\$2,050,000
Niagara remedial work.....	1,000,000	500,000

(The amendment also provides for changes under "Construction, general" without revision in total amount requested.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in connection with title I, there were no Senate amendments in conference.

I wish to deal now with title II. There were no Senate amendments pertaining to the power-marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior.

Under "General investigations of the Bureau of Reclamation," the House

agreed to the Senate amendment, which provides \$5,680,000 in lieu of the \$5,270,000 proposed by the House.

For "Construction and rehabilitation" the conferees agreed on \$131,225,500, which is \$7,735,500 below the amount approved by the Senate, and \$5,325,500 above the amount allowed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a tabulation showing the breakdown of the construction and rehabilitation item.

There being no objection, the table, Bureau of Reclamation—Construction and rehabilitation, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Bureau of Reclamation—Construction and rehabilitation

Projects	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance	Projects	Budget allowance	House estimate	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
Construction and rehabilitation:					Construction and rehabilitation—Continued				
Gila project, Arizona.....	\$1,077,000	\$1,077,000	\$1,077,000	\$1,077,000	Minidoka project, North Side pumping division, Idaho.....	\$2,768,000	\$2,768,000	\$2,768,000	\$2,768,000
Palo Verde diversion project, Arizona-California.....	3,702,000	3,702,000	3,702,000	3,702,000	Palisades project, Idaho.....	5,787,000	5,787,000	5,787,000	5,787,000
Parker-Davis project, Arizona-California-Nevada.....	312,000	312,000	312,000	312,000	Fort Peck project, Montana-North Dakota.....	118,000	118,000	118,000	118,000
Boulder Canyon project, Arizona-Nevada.....	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	Middle Rio Grande project, New Mexico.....	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Boulder City Municipal Office, Nevada.....	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	Washita Basin project, Oklahoma.....	500,000	375,000	500,000	500,000
Central Valley project, California.....	19,393,000	19,393,000	19,393,000	19,393,000	Deschutes project, north unit, Oregon.....	1,035,000	1,035,000	1,035,000	1,035,000
Santa Maria project, California.....	6,171,000	6,171,000	6,171,000	6,171,000	Rogue River Basin, Talent division, Oregon.....	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
Solano project, California.....	12,200,000	12,200,000	12,200,000	12,200,000	Savage Rapids Dam, fish protection facilities, Oregon.....		208,000	208,000	208,000
Ventura project, California.....	250,000	250,000	2,250,000	2,250,000	Provo River project, Utah.....	659,000	659,000	659,000	659,000
Collbran project, Colorado.....	1,000,000		1,000,000	1,000,000	Weber Basin project, Utah.....	10,066,000	10,066,000	10,066,000	10,066,000
Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado.....	530,000	530,000	530,000	530,000					
Micahud Flats project, Idaho.....	2,480,000	2,480,000	2,480,000	2,480,000					

Bureau of Reclamation—Construction and rehabilitation—Continued

Projects	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance	Projects	Budget allowance	House estimate	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
Construction and rehabilitation—Continued					Construction and rehabilitation—Continued				
Chief Joseph Dam project, Foster Creek division, Washington	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	Missouri River Basin project—Continued				
Columbia Basin project, Washington	13,850,000	13,850,000	13,850,000	13,850,000	Owl Creek unit, Wyoming	\$1,397,000	\$1,397,000	\$1,397,000	\$1,397,000
Yakima project, Kennewick division, Washington	1,288,000	1,288,000	1,288,000	1,288,000	Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000
Yakima project, Roza division, Washington	1,720,000	1,720,000	1,720,000	1,720,000	Sargent unit, Nebraska	728,000	728,000	728,000	728,000
Egen project, Wyoming	869,000	869,000	869,000	869,000	St. Francis unit, Colorado-Kansas	317,000			
Shoshone project, Wyoming	554,000	554,000	554,000	554,000	Transmission division	8,255,000	2,755,000	2,755,000	2,755,000
Drainage and minor construction program	984,000	984,000	984,000	984,000	Webster unit, Kansas	540,000	540,000	540,000	540,000
Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects	3,305,000	3,305,000	3,530,000	3,530,000	Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming	10,850,000		7,510,000	
Missouri River Basin project:					Drainage and minor construction program	634,000	634,000	634,000	634,000
Bostwick division, Nebraska-Kansas	4,690,000	4,690,000	4,690,000	4,690,000	Missouri River Basin investigations	3,105,000	2,654,000	3,105,000	2,879,500
Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska	3,151,000	3,151,000	3,151,000	3,151,000	Other department agencies	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
Glendo unit, Wyoming	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	Total Missouri River Basin	52,732,000	33,074,000	42,785,000	35,049,500
Hanover Bluff unit, Wyoming	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	Reduction due to available unobligated balances		-4,425,000	-4,425,000	-4,425,000
Helena Valley unit, Montana	2,500,000	(?)	1,750,000	1,750,000	Total construction and rehabilitation	150,900,000	125,900,000	138,961,000	131,225,500
Kirwin unit, Kansas	2,055,000	2,055,000	2,055,000	2,055,000	Upper Colorado River Basin fund:				
Lower Marias unit, Montana	155,000	115,000	115,000	115,000	Colorado River storage project and participating projects	8,000,000	6,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000

NOTE 1.—Senate increase for rehabilitation of Bitter Root irrigation district, Montana.

NOTE 2.—House report disallowed new funds in view of the fact that there is no repayment contract with either the city of Helena for municipal water supply or with supplemental water users in the irrigation project area. However, should these deficiencies be overcome during the fiscal year committee approves use of \$2,250,000 prior year funds to initiate construction.

Senate report states that it is the view of the Senate committee that construction should proceed immediately on this unit, and allowed \$1,750,000 new funds to provide for the budget program of \$4 million. However, the Senate committee urges the Bureau of Reclamation to continue its negotiations with the supplemental water users and the city of Helena to provide for additional repayment on the unit.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, with respect to operation and maintenance, the House agreed to the Senate amendment.

On the Colorado River Basin item the House agreed to the Senate amount and the Senate receded on its amendment to transfer the appropriation to the appropriation for construction and rehabilitation.

Under "Administrative provisions" the Senate receded on its amendment per-

taining to recreational facilities, and the House agreed to the remaining Senate amendments in this section.

Proceeding to title III, the House agreed to the Senate amount for cemetery expenses. Similarly the House agreed to the Senate amendment on general investigations of the Corps of Engineers.

On "Construction, general," the conferees agreed on \$455,949,500, which is \$7,723,500 below the amount approved

NOTE 3.—House states that should pending legislation or a favorable response to the Department's condemnation action permit entry to the dam site which is on land owned by the Crow Indian Tribe carryover balance of \$3,340,000 would be available for construction.

Senate allows \$7,510,000 to provide a total program of \$10,850,000—the budget estimate, and states that it is the hope of the committee that the problems pertaining to the acquisition of the site will be resolved at an early date. Legislation was recently vetoed.

NOTE 4.—House eliminated the \$451,000 program for the Oahe unit and stated that should additional funds be necessary to complete reports, any unobligated balances existing in connection with the basin investigations may be used for this purpose.

Senate states that it is the view of the Senate committee that the budget estimate is required to finance the investigations program.

by the Senate and \$33,915,500 above the amount allowed by the House.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a tabulation showing a breakdown of the construction and planning items as passed by the House, as passed by the Senate, and as agreed to in conference.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Corps of Engineers—Construction, general, fiscal year 1957

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1957		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Alaska:								
Craig Harbor					\$365,000		\$365,000	
Elfin Cove					173,000		173,000	
Gold Creek	\$393,000		\$393,000		393,000		393,000	
Ketchikan Harbor	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Kodiak Harbor					500,000		500,000	
Pelican Harbor					362,000		362,000	
Sitka Harbor						\$31,000		\$31,000
Valdez Harbor	(?)		(?)		(?)		(?)	
Alabama:								
Columbia lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia		\$75,000		\$75,000		75,000		75,000
Fort Gaines lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
Jackson lock and dam					750,000		750,000	
Mobile Harbor	2,543,000		2,543,000		2,543,000		2,543,000	
Paint Rock River				50,000		50,000		50,000
Warrior lock and dam	4,580,000		4,580,000		4,580,000		4,580,000	
Arizona:								
Painted Rock Reservoir	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
Whitlow Ranch Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000

See footnotes at end of table.

Corps of Engineers—Construction, general, fiscal year 1957—Continued

Construction, general, State and project  (1)	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1957		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
<b>Arkansas:</b>								
Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma (emergency bank stabilization and channel rectification)	\$3,000,000		\$3,000,000		\$3,000,000		\$3,000,000	
Beaver Reservoir				\$250,000		\$250,000		\$250,000
Callon			400,000		400,000		400,000	
Dardanelle lock and dam			500,000		750,000		650,000	
De Gray Reservoir						20,000		20,000
Greer's Ferry Reservoir			180,000		750,000		750,000	
McKinney Bayou and Barkman Creek, Ark. and Tex.				25,000		25,000		25,000
Murfreesboro Reservoir		\$ (830,000)		\$ (30,000)		\$ (30,000)		\$ (30,000)
Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La.		130,000		130,000		130,000		130,000
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La.	500,000		500,000			650,000		575,000
Table Rock Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Missouri.)								
Walnut Bayou						25,000		25,000
<b>California:</b>								
American River levees	\$ 400,000		400,000		500,000		450,000	
Black Butte Reservoir		\$ 125,000		125,000		125,000		125,000
Carbon Canyon Dam and Channel		59,000		59,000		59,000		59,000
Crescent City Harbor	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Devil, East Twin, Warm, and Lytle Creeks	\$ 1,150,000		1,150,000		1,150,000		1,150,000	
Half Moon Bay Harbor		\$ 53,000		53,000		53,000		53,000
Hogan Reservoir		\$ 293,000		293,000		293,000		293,000
Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors	\$ 485,000		485,000		485,000		485,000	
Los Angeles County drainage area	16,500,000		16,500,000		17,500,000		17,500,000	
Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Middle Creek		\$ 70,000		70,000		70,000		70,000
New Melones Reservoir		\$ 100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor	355,000		355,000		355,000		355,000	
Redondo Beach Harbor	1,500,000		1,500,000		2,000,000		1,750,000	
Removal of West Basin Bridge, Los Angeles	\$ 245,000		245,000		245,000		245,000	
Richmond Harbor	\$ 1,850,000		1,850,000		1,850,000		1,850,000	
Riverside	750,000		750,000		750,000		750,000	
Russian River Reservoir	2,150,000		2,150,000		2,150,000		2,150,000	
Sacramento River	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries (active units)	\$ 250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000	
Sacramento River deep water channel	\$ 2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000	
San Antonio and Chino Creeks	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
San Joaquin River, Stockton deepwater channel	\$ 450,000		450,000		450,000		450,000	
San Lorenzo Creek		164,000		164,000		164,000		164,000
San Lorenzo River	\$ 307,000	( <sup>c</sup> )	307,000		307,000		307,000	
Santa Clara River				50,000		50,000		50,000
Santa Maria River						50,000		50,000
Success Reservoir	\$ 2,490,000		2,490,000		2,490,000		2,490,000	
Terminus Reservoir	\$ 558,000		558,000		558,000		558,000	
<b>Connecticut:</b>								
Connecticut River below Hartford:								
(a) Eightmile River	( <sup>i</sup> )		( <sup>i</sup> )		( <sup>i</sup> )		( <sup>i</sup> )	
New Haven Harbor					536,000		None	
Silver Beach to Cedar Beach	( <sup>i</sup> )		( <sup>i</sup> )		( <sup>i</sup> )		( <sup>i</sup> )	
Thomaston Reservoir	360,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
<b>Delaware:</b>								
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea. (See New Jersey.)								
Inland Waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md.:								
Summit Bridge	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
<b>District of Columbia:</b>								
Anacostia River, D. C. and Md.	\$ 1,682,000		1,682,000		1,682,000		1,682,000	
<b>Florida:</b>								
Apalachicola Bay:								
(a) Channel across St. George Island	313,000		313,000		313,000		313,000	
(b) 6-foot channel at Eastpoint and 9-foot channel and turning basin at Scipio Creek			45,000		45,000		45,000	
Apalachicola River channel improvement	445,000		445,000		445,000		445,000	
Central and Southern Florida	\$ 8,750,000		8,750,000		10,000,000		8,750,000	
Intraoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami	200,000				200,000		200,000	
Jim Woodruff lock and dam, Florida and Georgia	1,197,000		1,197,000		1,197,000		1,197,000	
St. Augustine Harbor	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
St. Petersburg Harbor	\$ 22,000		22,000		22,000		22,000	
Tampa Harbor: 30-, 34-, and 36-foot harbor channels	2,500,000		2,500,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
<b>Georgia:</b>								
Buford Dam	\$ 4,553,000		4,553,000		4,553,000		4,553,000	
Columbia lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)								
Fort Gaines lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)								
Hartwell Reservoir, Ga. and S. C.	10,000,000		10,000,000		10,000,000		10,000,000	
Jim Woodruff lock and dam, Florida and Georgia. (See Florida.)								
Savannah Harbor	415,000		415,000		415,000		415,000	
Savannah River below Augusta		40,000		40,000		40,000		40,000
<b>Hawaii:</b>								
Kawailae Harbor			1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000	
Nawiliwili Harbor	570,000		570,000		570,000		570,000	
<b>Idaho: Columbia River, local protection (justification reports)</b>								
<b>Illinois:</b>								
Alton		60,000		60,000		60,000		60,000
Beardstown	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Campbell's Island		40,000				40,000		40,000
Carlyle Reservoir		125,000		205,000		205,000		205,000
Clear Creek Drainage and Levee District	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
East St. Louis and vicinity	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
Hunt Drainage District and Lima Lake Drainage District				75,000		75,000		75,000
<b>Illinois Waterway:</b>								
Calumet-Say Channel, Part I	8,500,000		8,500,000		8,500,000		8,500,000	
Little Calumet River, Ill. and Ind.		24,000		24,000		24,000		24,000
Mississippi River, between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn. (exclusive of St. Anthony Falls, Minn., and lock 19 at Keokuk, Iowa), Ill., Iowa, and Mo.: Rectification of damages	60,000		60,000		60,000		60,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

## Corps of Engineers—Construction, general, fiscal year 1957—Continued

Construction, general, State and project (1)	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1957		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
Illinois—Continued								
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.: Regulating works					\$200,000		\$200,000	
New Harmony Bridge, Ill. and Ind.			\$332,000		332,000		332,000	
Wabash Railroad bridges at Meredosia and Valley City	\$500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Wilson and Wenkel and Prairie du Pont Drainage and Levee District	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Wood River Drainage and Levee District	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
Indiana:								
Evansville				\$50,000		\$50,000		\$50,000
Little Calumet River, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)								
Mansfield Reservoir	\$500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Markland locks and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio	5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000	
New Harmony Bridge, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)								
Vincennes	\$100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000	
Iowa:								
Coralville Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
Little Sioux River	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,250,000		2,250,000	
Lock No. 19 at Keokuk	1,400,000		1,400,000		1,400,000		1,400,000	
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and Missouri	\$1,700,000		2,850,000		2,850,000		2,850,000	
Missouri River:								
Kansas City to Omaha	3,300,000		3,300,000		3,300,000		3,300,000	
Omaha to Sioux City	5,400,000		5,650,000		6,500,000		6,500,000	
Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Miners Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa. (See Nebraska.)								
Muscatine	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
Muscatine Island Levee District and Muscatine-Louisa County Drainage District No. 13		\$75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000
Rathbun Reservoir		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
Red Rock Reservoir				50,000		100,000		100,000
Sabula	284,000		284,000		284,000		284,000	
Upper Iowa River	\$500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Kansas:								
Abilene	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
Council Grove Reservoir						150,000		150,000
Elk City Reservoir						75,000		75,000
Kansas City, Kans. and Mo.	\$1,000,000		800,000		1,000,000		800,000	
Manhattan		40,000		40,000		40,000		40,000
Milford Reservoir						90,000		None
Missouri River agricultural levees, Kansas, Iowa, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
Ottawa		80,000		80,000		80,000		80,000
Pomona Reservoir		60,000		85,000		85,000		85,000
Salina	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
Strawn Reservoir		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
Topeka	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
Toronto Reservoir	4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000	
Tuttle Creek	9,000,000		9,000,000		9,000,000		9,000,000	
Wichita and Valley Center	\$1,163,000		1,163,000		1,163,000		1,163,000	
Kentucky:								
Barbourville	765,000		765,000		765,000		765,000	
Buckhorn Reservoir	\$1,000,000				1,000,000		1,000,000	
Catlettsburg	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Greenup locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio	9,900,000		9,900,000		9,900,000		9,900,000	
Lock and dam 41		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
Barkley Dam (Lower Cumberland lock and dam), Kentucky and Tennessee		200,000		1,100,000		1,100,000		1,100,000
Markland locks and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. (See Indiana.)								
New Richmond lock and dams, Kentucky and Ohio		50,000		100,000		150,000		125,000
Nolin Reservoir		50,000		100,000		150,000		100,000
Rough River Reservoir and channels	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
Louisiana:								
Amite River and tributaries		\$50,000	200,000		475,000		337,500	
Bayou Segnette Waterway					435,000		435,000	
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (New Orleans district):								
(a) Plaquemine-Morgan City alternate route	4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000	
(b) Franklin Canal	\$35,000		35,000		35,000		35,000	
Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to Gulf of Mexico						260,000		260,000
Mississippi River, gulf outlet						350,000		375,000
Morningport Reservoir, La. and Tex.		(35,000)				(35,000)		(35,000)
Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.)								
Overton-Red River Waterway		300,000				300,000		150,000
Red River levees below Denison Dam. (See Arkansas.)								
Maine:								
Portsmouth Harbor, N. H., and Piscataqua River, Maine and N. H. (See New Hampshire.)								
Rockland Harbor					810,000		810,000	
Scarboro River	205,000		205,000		205,000		205,000	
Maryland:								
Anacostia River, D. C. and Md. (See District of Columbia.)								
Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va.	3,400,000		3,400,000		3,400,000		3,400,000	
Inland Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (See Delaware.)								
Massachusetts:								
Adams	\$1,576,000		1,576,000		1,576,000		1,576,000	
Barre Falls Reservoir	1,150,000		1,150,000		1,150,000		1,150,000	
Boston Harbor, extension to 40-foot anchorage					1,000,000		1,100,000	
Buffumville Reservoir	1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000	
Cape Cod Canal					157,000		157,000	
Chatham (stage harbor)			167,000		167,000		167,000	
East Brimfield Reservoir	340,000		840,000		840,000		840,000	
Fall River Harbor	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Falmouth Harbor	(1)		(1)		(1)		(1)	
Hodges Village Reservoir	360,000		360,000		360,000		360,000	
Mystic River: 35-foot project	\$1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
Nantucket Harbor of Refuge					162,000		162,000	
Newburyport Harbor			143,000		143,000		143,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

Corps of Engineers—Construction, general, fiscal year 1957—Continued

Construction, general, State and project  (1)	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1957		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
<b>Massachusetts—Continued</b>								
North Adams.....	\$2,000,000		\$2,000,000		\$2,000,000		\$2,000,000	
Revere Beach.....	75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000	
Town River.....	302,000		302,000		302,000		302,000	
West Hill Reservoir.....				\$100,000				\$100,000
Weymouth Fore River.....	\$500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Worcester.....	840,000		840,000		840,000		840,000	
<b>Michigan:</b>								
Au Sable Harbor.....						\$10,000		10,000
Battle Creek.....	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Black River Harbor, Gogebic County.....	156,000		156,000		156,000		156,000	
Cheboygan River and Harbor.....					110,000		110,000	
Great Lakes connecting channels.....	\$4,000,000		4,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000	
Harrisville Harbor.....	\$160,000		285,000		260,000		260,000	
Holland Harbor.....			500,000		285,000		285,000	
Houghton-Hancock Bridge.....	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Port Austin Harbor.....	\$200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
Saginaw River.....		\$50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
Whitefish Point Harbor.....					100,000		100,000	
<b>Minnesota:</b>								
Hastings Harbor.....	(1)		(1)		(1)		(1)	
Red River of the North, S. Dak., N. Dak., and Minn.....	225,000		225,000		325,000		325,000	
Winona Harbor.....	(1)		(1)		(1)		(1)	
<b>Missouri:</b>								
Bear Creek Reservoir.....		60,000		60,000		60,000		60,000
Canton.....	275,000		275,000		275,000		275,000	
Cape Girardeau (Reach No. 2 only).....	\$1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Fabius River Drainage District.....				75,000		75,000		75,000
Kansas City, Kans. and Mo. (See Kansas.)								
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo. (See Illinois.)								
Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth.....	2,000,000		2,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
Missouri River, Kansas City to Sioux City. (See Iowa.)								
Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts 1, 2, and 3.....	\$800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
Pomme de Terre Reservoir.....	\$500,000		500,000		800,000		800,000	
St. Louis.....		\$551,000		551,000		551,000		551,000
Table Rock Reservoir, Mo. and Ark.....	14,750,000		14,750,000		14,750,000		14,750,000	
<b>Montana:</b>								
Billings.....					200,000		200,000	
Fort Peck Dam: Second powerplant.....	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
<b>Nebraska:</b>								
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Miners Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, Nebr., and S. Dak.....	1,100,000		1,100,000		1,400,000		1,400,000	
Norfolk.....		35,000		35,000		35,000		35,000
Waterloo.....		6,000		6,000		6,000		6,000
<b>Nevada:</b>								
Mathews Canyon Reservoir.....	\$250,000				250,000		250,000	
Pine Canyon Reservoir.....					200,000		200,000	
<b>New Hampshire:</b>								
Hopkinton-Everett Reservoir.....		\$50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
Otter Brook Reservoir.....	1,250,000		1,250,000		1,250,000		1,250,000	
Portsmouth Harbor, N. H., and Piscataqua River, Maine and N. H.....	\$775,000		775,000		775,000		775,000	
<b>New Jersey:</b>								
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey:								
Marcus Hook and Mantua Creek anchorages, New Jersey and Pennsylvania.....	1,060,000		1,060,000		1,060,000		1,060,000	
Delaware River, Philadelphia to Trenton:								
Interim 35-foot project.....	6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000	
New York and New Jersey channels.....	3,500,000		3,500,000		4,500,000		4,000,000	
Staten Island Rapid Transit bridge, New York and New Jersey. (See New York.)								
<b>New Mexico:</b>								
Albuquerque.....		170,000		170,000		170,000		170,000
Artesia.....		25,000		25,000		25,000		25,000
Chamita Reservoir (Abiquiu).....	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
Los Esteros-Alamagordo Reservoirs.....		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
Two Rivers Reservoir.....		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
<b>New York:</b>								
Allegheny River Reservoir, N. Y. and Pa. (See Pennsylvania.)								
Barcelona Harbor.....	\$250,000		\$250,000		250,000		250,000	
Black Rock and Tonawanda Harbor (deepen channel to 21 ft.).....						6,000		6,000
Buffalo Harbor, North Entrance Channel.....					250,000		None	
Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal.....	1,030,000		1,030,000		1,030,000		1,030,000	
Genegantslet Reservoir.....						100,000		None
Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway: 13-foot depth through locks.....	\$275,000		275,000		275,000		275,000	
Jones Inlet.....	\$1,470,000		1,470,000		1,470,000		1,470,000	
New York and New Jersey Channels. (See New Jersey.)								
Oswego Harbor:								
Detached breakwaters.....	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Staten Island Rapid Transit Bridge, New York and New Jersey.....	1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000	
South Plymouth Reservoir.....						100,000		None
Wellsville.....	450,000		450,000		450,000		450,000	
<b>North Carolina:</b>								
Far Creek.....			179,000		179,000		179,000	
Manteo Bay.....			570,000		570,000		570,000	
Wilkesboro Reservoir.....		25,000		25,000		25,000		25,000
Wilmington Harbor.....	\$1,543,000		1,543,000		1,543,000		1,543,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

Corps of Engineers—Construction, general, fiscal year 1957—Continued

Construction, general, State and project (1)	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1957		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
North Dakota:								
Garrison Reservoir.....	\$11,300,000		\$11,300,000		\$16,000,000		\$16,000,000	
Lower Heart River.....		\$60,000		\$60,000		\$60,000		\$60,000
Marmarth.....	217,000		217,000		217,000		217,000	
Red River of the North, N. Dak., S. Dak., and Minn. (See Minnesota.)								
Ohio:								
Ashtabula Harbor: East outer harbor.....	1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000	
Cleveland Harbor: Bridge replacements and channel improvements.....	\$1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000	
Dillon Reservoir.....					1,500,000		1,500,000	
Greenup lock and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)								
Markland lock and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. (See Indiana.)								
Muskingum River Reservoirs.....	\$425,000		425,000		425,000		425,000	
New Cumberland lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia.....	\$8,000,000		8,000,000		8,000,000		8,000,000	
New Richmond lock and dams, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)								
Toledo Harbor (removal of center dike).....			380,000		380,000		380,000	
Oklahoma:								
Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)								
Denison Reservoir, Texas and Oklahoma (see Texas). Enid.....						38,000		None
Eufaula Reservoir.....			500,000		2,000,000		1,250,000	
Keystone Reservoir.....					1,500,000		1,500,000	
Oklahoma City Floodway.....	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
Oologah Reservoir.....	\$4,000,000		3,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
Oregon:								
Amazon Creek.....	100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000	
Chetco River.....					225,000		225,000	
Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington.....	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
Columbia River between Chinook and Head of Sand Island, Oreg. and Wash.....		13,000		13,000		13,000		13,000
Coos Bay.....	\$300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
Cougar Reservoir.....	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,800,000		1,650,000	
Green Peter Reservoir.....		100,000		100,000		300,000		200,000
Hills Creek Reservoir.....	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,250,000		2,125,000	
Holley Reservoir.....						100,000		100,000
John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington.....		500,000		1,450,000		1,200,000		1,450,000
Johnson Creek.....	\$150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000	
Lower Columbia River improvements to existing works:								
(a) Beaver Drainage District.....						13,000		13,000
(e) John Drainage District.....						7,000		7,000
(g) Midland Drainage District.....						8,000		8,000
(h) Multnomah County Drainage District No. 1.....						8,000		8,000
(i) Peninsula Drainage District No. 1.....						59,000		59,000
(j) Peninsula Drainage District No. 2.....						59,000		59,000
(k) Rainier Drainage District.....						34,000		34,000
(l) Sanvie Island Drainage District.....						38,000		38,000
Malheur Improvement District.....	(1)		(1)		(1)		(1)	
McNary lock and dam, Oregon and Washington.....	\$4,500,000		2,828,000		4,500,000		2,828,000	
Pendleton.....		\$25,000		25,000		25,000		25,000
The Dalles Dam, Oreg. and Wash.....	\$42,457,000		42,457,000		42,457,000		42,457,000	
Skipanon Channel.....					185,000		185,000	
Tillamook Bay and Bar (Bay Ocean Peninsula).....	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
Umpqua River; Schofield River at Reedsport.....	(1)		(1)		(1)		(1)	
Willamette River, bank protection.....	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
Pennsylvania:								
Allegheny River Reservoir, N. Y. and Pa.....		\$284,000		384,000		384,000		384,000
Allentown.....		70,000		70,000		70,000		70,000
Bear Creek Reservoir.....	2,250,000		2,250,000		2,250,000		2,250,000	
Bethlehem.....		90,000		90,000		90,000		90,000
Bradford.....	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea. (See New Jersey.)								
Delaware River, Philadelphia to Trenton. (See New Jersey.)								
Dyberry Reservoir.....	600,000				600,000		600,000	
Kettle Creek Reservoir.....		95,000		95,000		95,000		95,000
Presque Isle Peninsula.....	380,000		380,000		380,000		380,000	
Prompton Reservoir.....	550,000		550,000		550,000		550,000	
Reynoldsville.....	578,000		578,000		578,000		578,000	
Stillwater Reservoir.....	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
Swoyersville-Forty Fort.....	625,000		625,000		625,000		625,000	
Rhode Island:								
Bullocks Point Cove.....			174,000		174,000		174,000	
Sand Hill Cove Beach.....					40,000		40,000	
Sakonnet Harbor.....					600,000		600,000	
Woonsocket.....	600,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
South Carolina:								
Channel Port Royal Sound to Beaufort.....	\$401,000		401,000		401,000		401,000	
Hartwell Reservoir, Ga. and S. C. (See Georgia.)								
South Dakota:								
Big Bend Reservoir.....						150,000		150,000
Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Miners Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, Nebr., and S. Dak. (See Nebraska.)								
Oahe Reservoir.....	\$27,500,000		27,500,000		27,500,000		27,500,000	
Red River of the North, N. Dak., S. Dak., and Minn. (See Minnesota.)								
Sioux Falls.....	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
Tennessee:								
Cheatham lock and dam.....	\$2,900,000		2,900,000		2,900,000		2,900,000	
Lake City.....		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
Barkley Dam (lower Cumberland lock and dam) Kentucky and Tennessee. (See Kentucky.)								
Memphis, Wolf River and Nonconnah Creek.....	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
Old Hickory lock and dam.....	\$2,250,000		2,250,000		2,250,000		2,250,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

Corps of Engineers—Construction, general, fiscal year 1957—Continued

Construction, general, State and project  (1)	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1957		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
<b>Texas:</b>								
Brazos Island Harbor.....	\$400,000		\$400,000		\$400,000		\$400,000	
Buffalo Bayou.....	2 6,900,000		6,900,000		6,900,000		6,900,000	
Canyon Reservoir.....	1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000	
Cooper Reservoir and Channels.....				\$125,000		\$125,000		\$125,000
Corpus Christi Bridge.....	2 500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Dallas Floodway.....	2,600,000		2,600,000		2,600,000		2,600,000	
Denison Reservoir (Lake Texoma), Texas and Oklahoma: (a) Recreational facilities.....					250,000		250,000	
(b) Highway Bridge at Willis site.....					800,000		800,000	
Ferrell's Bridge Reservoir.....	4,300,000		4,300,000		4,300,000		4,300,000	
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: (a) Channel in Colorado River (Bay City).....						20,000		20,000
(b) Guadalupe River, channel to Victoria.....	2 110,000		110,000		110,000		110,000	
(c) Realignment vicinity of Aransas Pass.....		\$31,000		31,000		31,000		31,000
Houston ship channel: 36-foot project.....	730,000		730,000		730,000		730,000	
Kenedy.....		2 36,000		36,000		36,000		36,000
McGee Bend Dam.....	4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
McKinney Bayou and Barkman Creek, Ark. and Tex. (See Arkansas.)								
Mooringsport Reservoir, La. and Tex. (See Louisiana.)		60,000		60,000		60,000		60,000
Navarro Mills Reservoir.....								
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway: 34-foot Tule Lake Channel extension.....	319,000		319,000		319,000		319,000	
36-foot channel.....	330,000		330,000		330,000		330,000	
Channel to LaQuinta.....					500,000		500,000	
Proctor Reservoir.....						75,000		75,000
Red River levees below Denison Dam. (See Arkansas.)								
Sabine-Neches Waterway.....	2 695,000		695,000		695,000		695,000	
San Antonio.....	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
Texarkana Reservoir.....	1,226,000		1,226,000		1,226,000		1,226,000	
Waco Reservoir.....		100,000		100,000		300,000		200,000
Utah: Salt Lake City.....						53,000		53,000
<b>Vermont:</b>								
Ball Mountain Reservoir.....	2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000	
East Barre Reservoir (modification).....	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
North Hartland Reservoir.....		300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000
North Springfield Reservoir.....	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Rutland.....		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
Townshend Reservoir.....	420,000		420,000		420,000		420,000	
Waterbury local protection.....		100,000				100,000		None
Waterbury Reservoir (modification).....	808,000		808,000		808,000		808,000	
Wrightsville Reservoir (modification).....	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
<b>Virginia:</b>								
Kings Creek.....					(1)		(1)	
Norfolk Harbor: Craney Island disposal area.....	2 1,784,000		1,784,000		1,784,000		1,784,000	
Norfolk and Portsmouth Belt Line R.R. bridge.....	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Parrotts Creek.....					(1)		(1)	
Thimble Shoal Channel.....	820,000		820,000		820,000		820,000	
Waterway coast of Virginia, Chesapeake Bay to Chincoteague Bay.....					300,000		300,000	
<b>Virgin Islands:</b>								
Christiansted Harbor.....					2,000		2,000	
St. Thomas Harbor.....					2,000		2,000	
<b>Washington:</b>								
Bellingham Harbor.....	2 400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
Blaine Harbor.....					116,000		116,000	
Chief Joseph Dam.....	2 9,500,000		9,500,000		9,500,000		9,500,000	
Columbia River at Baker Bay.....						70,000		70,000
Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
Columbia River between Chinook and Head of Sand Island, Oreg. and Wash. (See Oregon.)								
Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg.—27-foot channel. (See Oregon.)								
Eagle Gorge Reservoir.....	6,300,000		6,300,000		6,300,000		6,300,000	
Everett Harbor and Snohomish River.....					120,000		120,000	
Grays Harbor and Chehalis River.....					61,000		61,000	
Ice Harbor lock and dam.....	8,000,000		8,000,000		8,000,000		8,000,000	
John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
Lower Columbia River levees at new locations: Washougal area.....		1 17,000		17,000		17,000		17,000
McNary lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
Quillayute River.....			444,000		444,000		444,000	
Shilshole Bay.....	2 300,000		300,000		400,000		400,000	
Stillaguamish River.....						5,000		5,000
The Dalles Dam, Oreg. and Wash. (See Oregon.)								
Willapa River and Harbor and Naselle River.....					130,000		130,000	
<b>West Virginia:</b>								
Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va. (See Maryland.)								
Hildebrand lock and dam.....	2,000,000		2,000,000		3,500,000		2,750,000	
New Cumberland lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
Summersville Reservoir.....		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
Sutton Reservoir.....	4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000	
<b>Wisconsin:</b>								
Milwaukee Harbor: River channels.....	130,000		130,000		130,000		130,000	
Prairie du Chien Harbor.....		14,000		14,000		14,000		14,000
<b>Wyoming:</b>								
Jackson Hole.....	2 400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
Sheridan.....		25,000				25,000		25,000
Local protection projects not requiring specific legislation.....	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,500,000		1,250,000	
Emergency bank protection.....	2 400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
Snagging and clearing.....	500,000		500,000		700,000		600,000	
Projects deferred for study.....		2 90,000		90,000		90,000		90,000
Small authorized projects.....	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>415,192,000</b>	<b>6,095,000</b>	<b>422,949,000</b>	<b>7,685,000</b>	<b>462,113,000</b>	<b>10,160,000</b>	<b>454,987,500</b>	<b>9,562,000</b>

See footnotes at end of table.

Corps of Engineers—Construction, general, fiscal year 1957—Continued

Construction, general, State and project  (1)	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1957		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
Wyoming—Continued								
Lower Columbia River fish-sanctuary program (Fish and Wildlife Service).....	\$1,400,000	-----	\$1,400,000	-----	\$1,400,000	-----	\$1,400,000	-----
Program total, construction, general.....	416,592,000 (422,687,000)	\$6,095,000	424,349,000	\$7,685,000	463,513,000	\$10,160,000	456,387,500	\$9,562,000
Reduction based on unobligated balances.....	-----	-----	-10,000,000	-----	-10,000,000	-----	-10,000,000	-----
Grand total, construction, general.....	416,592,000 (422,687,000)	6,095,000	414,349,000 (422,034,000)	7,685,000	453,513,000 (63,673,000)	10,160,000	446,387,500 (455,949,500)	9,562,000

<sup>1</sup> Included under item of \$2,000,000 for small authorized projects.

<sup>2</sup> Revised budget estimate.

<sup>3</sup> Included under planning request for "Deferred for restudy" projects.

<sup>4</sup> Recommended by House committee. Floor amendment prohibited use of funds for this project. Senate deleted amendment.

<sup>5</sup> In addition \$4,543,000 will be applied to this project from savings and slippages on projects that have received completion funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point in my remarks a tabulation showing the projects wherein the amount agreed to in conference is different from the amount approved by the Senate.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Project:	Reduction below Senate amount
Arkansas:	
Dardanelle lock and dam.....	\$100,000
Red River levees and bank stabilization.....	75,000
California:	
American River levees.....	50,000
Redondo Beach Harbor.....	250,000
Connecticut:	
New Haven Harbor.....	536,000
Florida:	
Central and southern Florida..	1,250,000
Kansas:	
Kansas City, Kans. and Mo...	200,000
Milford Reservoir.....	90,000
Kentucky:	
Lock and dam 41.....	250,000
New Richmond lock and dam..	25,000
Nolin Reservoir.....	50,000
Louisiana:	
Amite River and tributaries..	137,500
Mississippi River, gulf outlet..	25,000
Overton Red River Waterway..	150,000
Massachusetts:	
West Hill Reservoir.....	+100,000
New Jersey:	
New York and New Jersey channels.....	500,000
New York:	
Buffalo Harbor, north entrance channel.....	250,000
Genegantslet Reservoir.....	100,000
South Plymouth Reservoir....	100,000
Oklahoma:	
Enid.....	38,000
Eufaula Reservoir.....	750,000
Oregon:	
Cougar Reservoir.....	150,000
Green Peter Reservoir.....	100,000
Hills Creek Reservoir.....	125,000
John Day lock and dam.....	+250,000
McNary lock and dam.....	1,672,000
Texas:	
Waco Reservoir.....	100,000
Vermont:	
Townshend Reservoir.....	+200,000
Waterbury local protection...	100,000
West Virginia:	
Hildebrand lock and dam.....	750,000
Local protection projects (sec. 212).....	250,000
Snagging and clearing.....	100,000
Total reductions.....	8,273,500
Total increases.....	550,000
Net reductions.....	7,723,500

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on the item "Operation and maintenance," for which the Senate proposed an additional \$10 million for deferred maintenance, the House agreed to the Senate amendment.

On the item "General expenses," the House agreed to the Senate amendment.

On the item "Mississippi River and tributaries," the House agreed to the Senate amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, first of all, I should like to join my colleagues in congratulating the able Senator from Louisiana for the magnificent accomplishments which he and the conferees have achieved with respect to the bill.

Mr. President, I should like to make a little legislative history at this time. Some of the language of the conference report, if misinterpreted, poses an extreme, unwarranted, and unintended hazard to a number of irrigation projects in the Nation today, because the language to which I refer is susceptible of a completely false and illogical meaning unless we are able by this colloquy to indicate that no such hazard is involved. I refer to page 4 of the report, and I read the following sentence from it:

The conferees of both Houses are in agreement that no new contracts for construction of strictly irrigation features on any reclamation project shall be entered into where a repayment contract is required, until such repayment contract has been executed.

The first question I wish to ask my able friend from Louisiana is this: In his opinion, does this language of this report apply to any projects which are now in being?

Mr. ELLENDER. In my opinion it does not. When the language to which you refer was submitted, we were discussing new starts which were to be developed strictly as irrigation projects.

Mr. KUCHEL. In other words, as I understand the Senator's statement, in those instances where Congress in the past has authorized irrigation projects, or where any part of the work on such a type of project may be under way, the language to which the Senator and I refer does not apply, in his opinion.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. I appreciate the Senator's statement, because the situation

can be illustrated, I think, by referring to the Sacramento Canal project in California. A canal system was authorized by Congress as a part of the Central Valley project. For example, canals were built on parcel A and parcel B in the area. But between those two parcels there happens to be a railroad right-of-way. It would be ridiculous if the language were to be applied so as to prevent a construction contract being awarded to connect the canals under the railroad property. I use that merely as an example of the sort of thing as to which some Members of Congress were apprehensive that an unrealistic and unintended interpretation of this language in the report might be made.

Mr. ELLENDER. I repeat that the language which was suggested by the House as to several of the projects, which were to be built for irrigation only, was discussed with reference to new starts, and there was no discussion of its application to projects which have already been started.

Mr. KUCHEL. I take it that the Senator from Louisiana is familiar with the Sacramento Valley canal system.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am. I have been living with it for the past 8 years.

Mr. KUCHEL. The able Senator is a friend of that beneficent project. Is it the Senator's opinion that this language in no sense applies to the Sacramento Valley canal system?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my opinion.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Louisiana, as chairman of the committee of conference, has done notable work and has rendered excellent service, for which I congratulate him.

I should like to ask about one of the conference items relative to the State of Florida. I think the other two Florida items which were considered by the committee of conference—namely, the one affecting the Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville to Miami, and the one affecting Tampa Harbor—are quite clear from the listing. The House in each of those instances simply acceded to the action of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. But in the case of the third item, the central and southern Florida flood-control project, action was taken which represented something of a

change from the position of the Senate, and also a change from the position of the House.

My understanding of the action taken by the committee of conference relative to the central and southern Florida flood-control project is that the amount allowed by the House, \$8,750,000, was agreed upon by the conferees and appears in the conference report. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. But my understanding also is that that amount is distributed among construction and repayment of the local agency on account of action heretofore authorized by Congress in a way different from that shown by either bill originally.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. If he will recall, the Senate committee provided \$10 million. Out of that sum the State of Florida was to be repaid \$2,900,000.

The Senate conferees receded from the figure of \$10 million and accepted \$8,750,000.

The House conferees receded from their position, that of the \$8,750,000 which was provided by the House, \$2,900,000 was to be paid to the State of Florida. The House receded from that position and agreed that only \$750,000 of the \$8,750,000 was to be used for reimbursement of advanced funds, thereby leaving \$8 million for construction.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. It is my understanding that the \$750,000 represents the amount which the State agency had requested in repayment this year.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. So the State gets what it had asked for by way of partial repayment, and the construction project gets \$8 million, and everybody is as happy as can be with the smaller amount of money.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is exactly correct; and the repayment of the balance of the amount due the State is postponed.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is in this bill only an installment payment to the State of \$750,000. That is the amount which the State had requested be repaid in this particular year.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

#### CONTROL OF NARCOTICS, BARBITURATES, AND DANGEROUS DRUGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11320) to effect the control of narcotics, barbiturates, and dangerous drugs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MORSE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to

the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MORSE, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. HRUSKA conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the message of the Senate announcing its agreement to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1622) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment for certain improvements located on public lands in the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, of the Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9720) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 11, 18, 22, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, and 44 to the bill, and concurred therein.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 909. An act for the relief of Charles O. Ferry and other employees of the Alaska Road Commission; and

H. R. 1963. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence M. Augustine.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 906. An act for the relief of William Martin, of Tok Junction, Alaska; and

H. R. 7763. An act to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to expedite the final determination of the claims, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 83) requesting the return of enrolled bill S. 3581 to the Senate.

#### MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. LANGER. I object. We are going to hear one of the greatest speeches delivered on the floor of the Senate this

year, by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I think more Senators ought to hear him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will resume the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	McCarthy
Allott	Gore	McClellan
Anderson	Green	McNamara
Barrett	Hayden	Millikin
Beall	Hennings	Monroney
Bender	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bennett	Hill	Mundt
Bible	Holland	Murray
Bricker	Hruska	Neuberger
Bridges	Humphrey,	O'Mahoney
Bush	Minn.	Pastore
Butler	Humphreys,	Payne
Byrd	Ky.	Potter
Carlson	Ives	Purtell
Case, N. J.	Jackson	Robertson
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Clements	Kefauver	Scott
Cotton	Kennedy	Smathers
Curtis	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kuchel	Sparkman
Duff	Laird	Stennis
Dworshak	Langer	Symington
Eastland	Lehman	Thye
Ellender	Long	Watkins
Ervin	Magnuson	Welker
Flanders	Malone	Williams
Frear	Mansfield	Wofford
Fulbright	Martin, Iowa	Young
George	Martin, Pa.	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State convention.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair state the parliamentary situation affecting the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). The Chair will make the following statement in regard to the procedure to be observed in connection with the pending bill:

The committee amendment strikes out all after the enacting clause and inserts a complete substitute. In such cases, under the precedents of the Senate, the substitute is considered as original text for the purpose of amendment, and is subject to amendment in two degrees.

An amendment to the substitute, as also an amendment to the original House text, would be in the first degree only, and each would be subject to amendment in one further degree.

Amendments to the original House text, or to an amendment thereto, would have precedence, under rule XVIII, over an amendment to the substitute or an amendment thereto.

All amendments to the committee substitute or to the original House text, and amendments to each thereof, would have precedence over a vote on the committee substitute.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall ask the indulgence of the Senate that I not be interrupted in the course of what I hope will be a relatively brief statement on the bill. When I have finished, I shall be happy to answer, or to try to answer, any questions which may be asked.

Mr. President, the bill before the Senate is H. R. 11356. It is the Mutual Security Act of 1956, and is cast in the form of an amendment to the basic legislation—the Mutual Security Act of 1954. The House has so treated the bill, and it has been treated in the same way by the Senate Committee.

#### DIFFERENCES FROM HOUSE VERSION

By way of introduction I may say that the differences between the bill as passed by the House of Representatives and the bill reported to the Senate by the Committee on Foreign Relations are relatively few in number, but are of substantial importance.

The most important differences between the House version and the Senate version of the bill concern the sums of money which are authorized to be appropriated. In general terms the differences with respect to the sums in the two versions are as follows:

The President asked the Congress to authorize this year the appropriation of not to exceed \$4.7 billion. The House of Representatives reduced that authorization to \$3.6 billion—a cut in the President's request of about 20 percent, or a little over \$1.1 billion. The Committee on Foreign Relations recommends that the Senate authorize the appropriation of not to exceed \$4.3 billion, which is a restoration of some \$703 million in the direction of the President's request.

I may say at this point that \$100 million of that authorization results from striking out a provision in the House bill which would have repealed a portion of the act of 1954, which authorized an appropriation to the President for Asian economic development of \$200 million over a 3-year period. The Senate committee simply struck out the repeal of that section, which had the effect of raising the authorization recommended by the Senate committee by \$703 million in the direction of the President's request.

Continuing, in general terms, the Committee on Foreign Relations restored a total of \$600 million to the military-assistance figure, which had been reduced by \$1 billion by the House. Not only did we do that but we struck out a provision in the House bill which would have been disastrous had it become a part of the law, in that it undertook to limit to only \$402 million the military assistance to all the NATO countries, that is to say, all the countries in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. But moneywise the Senate committee simply restored \$600 million of the military-assistance figure for all areas of the world where we give assistance. We restored \$600 million of the \$1 billion reduction made by the House. The Senate committee restored a little more than \$100 million of the cut in economic funds which had been made by the other House, principally in the way I have already

described, by striking out a House provision repealing section 418 in the 1954 act.

I cite these figures to give the Senate a picture of the magnitude of the program we are discussing. Members who wish to explore in greater detail the sums authorized may examine the report of the committee. That report, to the extent practicable, spells out, country by country, the sums covered by the programs contemplated by this proposed legislation.

We have made the report as full as we reasonably could, in view of restrictions and the secrecy imposed with respect to certain items, which we had to consider. There is in the office of the committee, in this building, a report which any Member of the Senate may see. The committee staff is on the floor and will remain on the floor during the consideration of the bill, and will be pleased to give to any Member of the Senate any information he may wish.

I regret very much that in matters of this kind it is not advisable to make a full report of all the information which comes to the committee. I think it will be appreciated that much information comes to us on a confidential basis, and must remain so, because to divulge it would occasion us very much greater harm and cause very many more difficulties than we would otherwise have.

When Members of the Senate examine the committee report, however, they will find that precise figures on the amount of military assistance to be provided for particular countries are not given in detail. Generally speaking, they are given by regions. The reason, as I have already indicated, is obvious. It would not be in the national interest, in the opinion of the administrators, publicly to debate the amounts for military aid which have been planned for particular countries. I again remind the Senate, however, that the members of the staff are available, and will remain available during the entire consideration of the bill.

Members of the Senate will also find, when they consult the committee report, that the amount of economic assistance planned for certain countries is not listed. Again, the reason for omitting this information from the report is that a public listing of the amounts planned would invite debate which would not be in the national interest. This information, country by country, is also available to Members of the Senate on the same basis I have stated with reference to the military-aid figures. Sums for particular countries are not given, and the committee has followed the usual course in connection with mutual security legislation from the beginning, of omitting particular amounts for certain countries, for very obvious reasons. If a particular amount is given for country A, country A somehow concludes that it has a vested right in that recommendation, and it will, of course, arouse invidious comparisons by other countries, which think they ought to have a larger sum or a different sum from the amount specified for country A. At any rate, from the beginning of legislation of this

kind, we have tried to omit lists of particular countries or specific amounts for economic or any other form of aid authorized by the legislation.

There is no place in the Senate's participation in foreign policy for it to become the focal point of the petitions of representatives, official and nonofficial, of foreign nations.

No foreign nation should be given assistance under this program merely because it has lobbyists in the United States. Our assistance must be conditioned, not by outside pressures, but by the needs of this Nation as a whole—needs which are to be measured by the national interest, and by the national interest almost exclusively. It is exceedingly bad practice to single out individual countries in this kind of legislation, a point which I have already tried to stress.

To turn my attention now to some more general features of the problem before the Senate in considering this proposed legislation, there has been a great misunderstanding about the nature of the mutual-security program. Some people talk in terms of giveaway and foreign ratholes. Strangely enough, Mr. President, it is these very individuals taken as a whole and as a rule who say they are most concerned with the Communist threat. How that conclusion can be entirely logical is a bit beyond me, unless one has a doubt about the entire method and the entire program of foreign assistance. It is difficult for me to understand the reasoning behind much of that opposition, because a large share of the funds are for the purpose of building military forces which oppose communism. Other sizable sums are to be used to help foreign countries remain independent and non-Communist.

Let us take a look at this bill. Of the \$4.3 billion it authorizes—and let it always be borne in mind that the items in the bill authorize not to exceed a given sum, and that it is wholly within the prerogative and power and right of the Appropriations Committees of both Houses to say what the amount shall be, only that the amount cannot exceed the amount authorized by the bill—\$2.5 billion of the total amount is for direct military assistance to allies, an additional \$1.1 billion is for economic assistance to countries that are maintaining larger armed forces than they would otherwise be able to maintain, and the balance is for development assistance, for technical assistance, and for such special programs as the United Nations Children's Fund, the program to help escapees from the Iron Curtain, and so forth. Of the development assistance funds, which total \$243 million, 75 percent are required to be in the form of loans, except for those portions administered in connection with the disposition of agricultural surpluses or through regional programs.

Those who object to the \$2.5 billion this year for military assistance should take a very close look at what it does.

#### IMPORTANCE OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE IN ASIA

In Turkey, for example, it helps to maintain more divisions in being than we have in the United States.

In Korea the sums available are helping to maintain more divisions of Korean troops—battle-ried troops who, in most cases, face the Communists to the north—than we have in the United States.

In Formosa, in Pakistan, on the southern border of the Soviet Union, and at other critical points throughout the world we are helping to support in varying degrees a total of over 200 divisions, 2,000 naval ships, and 300 air squadrons.

It may be true that they are not all strictly modern, as we evaluate military arms, but they all have a value. It may be true that in many instances these divisions are furnished by small nations. But I may say that when the chips are down, Mr. President, small nations may be of very great consequence to the large nations of the earth.

With respect to our military assistance to the countries of the Far East and Asia, we must remember that most of them would not be able to maintain these forces without our help. They are not rich countries. But they have spirit and manpower. They are willing to defend themselves. It is in our national interest that these nations, if attacked, be in a position to slow or to stop the enemy. That is why we give them help. We give them help because if we did not, more of our own men would need to be under arms in far distant stations.

We give them help because if we did not there would be a standing invitation to the Communists to move into the defenseless vacuums that would exist.

#### IMPORTANCE OF NATO

The military assistance which this bill authorizes for Western Europe is in a lesser magnitude than that which we intend to supply for the Far East and Asia. But it is just as important in a slightly different way.

Most of these European countries are now economically able to support reasonably adequate armed forces of their own. Take the United Kingdom, for example. No military aid is planned this year for that nation. It maintains its own great navy and its own great air force. It has its own supplies of atomic weapons. Granted we helped them after the war to reestablish their military strength. But let us never forget that for 2 years prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor, the United Kingdom stood virtually alone against the forces of totalitarianism, protecting the heritage of freemen.

This bill does carry funds for assistance to other allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We know that we would stand together in the face of attack. They know, and we know, that we would need bases in their countries from which to launch a counterattack in the event the Soviet should risk the use of military means to achieve its ends.

It may be said that some of these nations would not stand with us, and someone may point to little Iceland, which yesterday or the day before had an election in which perhaps the majority of the votes cast indicates a sentiment in favor of inviting our armed servicemen to leave Iceland. That is quite natural, inasmuch as against the background of the whole population of Iceland, the number of

American troops in that country is exactly in the proportion of 6 million foreign troops on our soil as against our population of 160 or 165 million. So, very naturally, a large foreign force may easily become offensive to a small country like Iceland. Moreover, Iceland has not yet finally determined what course she will take.

In the course of the debate someone is likely to say that France has withdrawn many of her troops and transported them to Algeria, there to fight her battles. Perhaps not so many French soldiers as one might think have been sent to Algeria or elsewhere, and perhaps none of the weapons sent there have been other than conventional arms; but that situation will make little difference to those who wish to criticize France. That nation unquestionably faces some very difficult problems at this time. Nevertheless, there is nothing to indicate that we could not rely upon the support of the French people in the NATO organization if we were faced with actual aggression.

One thing I know, Mr. President, is that since the organization of NATO, not a single hostile bomb has fallen upon a single American country, upon a single American city, or upon a single American home. Another thing we should know is that the NATO organization has been standing between the free states of Western Europe and the Russian aggressor.

I call attention to the fact that the total NATO armed forces exceed our own. They augment our naval forces and our air forces by more than 100 percent. These nations are bound with us by the North Atlantic Treaty, in which we jointly have agreed to view an attack on any one member as an attack on all.

I do not believe that war is inevitable. I have never accepted that philosophy. On the contrary, I think it is avoidable. Indeed, there is a chance that conditions have so changed in the past year that our children may be able to avoid the horrors of another war. But they will not be able to avoid that danger if we begin in this bill to liquidate the military strength of the free world. We have so built and maintained our joint defenses that potential aggressors have been put on notice that Soviet aggression cannot lead to victory.

In good time we may be able to reduce the size of our military-assistance program, but I doubt the wisdom of such a move this year.

Yesterday the Senate said that our military power should be increased. Who is there to say that the Senate was wrong? It is true that time may prove the Senate to have been wrong, but, yet, it would not prove we had committed a mistake.

#### FUNDAMENTAL CHANGES IN SOVIET

It has seemed apparent to me for some time that substantial changes have been taking place within the Soviet Union. They may not be basic, but these changes arise from a number of factors. Important, certainly, was the death of Stalin. This event had a tremendous impact within the totalitarian state which for three decades had been conditioned to one-man rule. It was the Communist system which produced Stalin. That

system may well produce another Stalin. On the other hand, I do not yet believe we have seen the end of the Communist changes stemming from the death of Stalin.

We do know that his death has led to a committee type of dictatorship instead of a one-man dictatorship. It has led to increased demands on the part of the Russian people and the people of the satellites for more of the material things of life. A new generation is taking over from Stalin and in a few years others will succeed to power. Each of these succeeding generations will demand more good things from life than their predecessors. Each succeeding generation in Russia is better educated than the last. Education can be a good or a bad thing. I am inclined to agree with H. G. Wells, however, who wrote that "history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe."

But the future is not only one of darkness. There is a spark of hope for mankind that has arisen from man's understanding of the atom.

There are those who believe that the Geneva Big Four Conference of a year ago was a mistake. I do not share that belief. It is a matter of opinion. Some hold—and it is their right so to believe—that the Geneva Conference has led to a vast slackening of the will of the free world to build its defenses against atomic attack.

It has seemed to me, however, that the real achievement of the Geneva Conference was to crystallize the realization of the world that a great war would destroy the attacker as well as the defender. This tacit understanding has not been put into written words. But the fact that the understanding exists is evident by the changed tactics of the Soviet Union in the last year.

While—I repeat—the changes may not all be fundamental, they, nevertheless, are changes which I think the free world is bound to note.

While I believe during the past year that the Soviet switch from the threat of a military offensive to the threat of an economic offensive is in part attributed to this recognition of the danger of atomic destruction, it is also attributable to the fact that the free nations of the world have by their joint military strength made it clear that communism cannot be advanced by military conquest without the gravest threat to the home base of communism itself.

Certainly, our preparedness in connection with the war in Korea has played an important part in driving the Soviets to that conclusion.

It is true, however, that the Soviet by its switch from a military emphasis to an economic emphasis in its attack on freedom has had a tendency to induce us to lower our guard. That is human nature. Unless we take care to see that the alliances we have built to oppose Communist military action are adapted to meet Communist threats on other fronts, there is danger not only that our military defense may be weakened, but that the vastly greater economic strength of free nations may be sapped by Communist-induced divisions among friends.

I hope we may not be lulled to sleep, letting our defenses fall into discard. It is in our interest to support strong regional defense groupings, especially as we have now reached the point where such important sources of military power as the United Kingdom with its great naval, air, and atomic power are able to proceed on their own without any financial assistance from the United States. In time we may be able to slacken our military assistance. But to do so now would seem to me to invite disaster.

#### REVOLUTION AGAINST HUNGER

In the world of today we must also take account of the fact that huge masses of people are determined to raise their living standards. This revolution is going on independently of the struggle against Communist imperialism. In our own interest we must be ready to help these people choose a peaceful, democratic way of advancing rather than the Communist way. The bill, therefore, contains funds to help these people move toward freedom.

#### DANGER OF REDUCED AUTHORIZATION

If our consideration of this measure follows the usual pattern, we can expect that there will be some amendments offered that will go to the substance of the bill and others that will go only to the amounts authorized to be appropriated.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has examined at length all proposed amendments that have been brought to its attention. Some of those amendments have proposed to increase funds authorized; others have proposed to decrease the funds; and yet other amendments have sought to make various other changes. The committee adopted those amendments which it considered would serve the national interest. It rejected those which a majority felt would not best serve the national interest.

Our consideration was based upon more than 1,000 pages of testimony received from the foremost authorities in our Government and from many leading private citizens. On the basis of the testimony of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Director of the International Cooperation Administration, and numerous specialists, we have sought to balance the needs as seen by the experts with the political judgment of Senators on the committee.

Under these circumstances, it seems to me that those Members of this body who may want to alter drastically our approach to mutual security must assume the risk of drastic change. The greatest risk we face in consideration of this bill is that we may by ill-considered action sacrifice our present necessary position in world affairs.

I am very well aware that there are persons in the United States who think we do not have any obligations beyond our own shores. I can understand that there may be some in this body who entertain very much the same feeling. But I repeat that the greatest risk which we will assume in the consideration of the bill, if it be drastically changed, and if its direction be diverted, will be, not only possibly, but probably, the sacrifice

of our present necessary position of leadership in world affairs.

There are some persons in the United States who do not care whether we have any position in world affairs. I certainly am not among them, and I hope I shall never be numbered among them.

Mr. President, the sums contained in the bill are important in their own right, I think, in the sense that they are needed for the purposes for which they are provided. They might be trimmed a little here or there. But any substantial cuts in the bill will involve us in consequences more far-reaching than can be measured by a few tanks or a few aircraft.

It is a fact that the United States is in a position of leadership in the world today. I do not assert that in the sense of arrogant pride, because, in my opinion, real world leaders are people of great humility of spirit rather than of arrogant pride. Yet, although we are in a position of leadership, we did not seek it; we did not ask for it. It devolved upon us because of our geographic position, our natural wealth, our great industrial machine, and our tradition as a champion of freedom, and because of the heroism and fortitude of the men and women who from the beginning have made America.

World leadership comes only to a people who in a time of great stress have risen to the challenge of stirring times, and have assumed their responsibilities because they were elevated by the mighty impulse which comes to a free people who want to live beyond narrow selfish interests.

Is there any Member of the Senate or any person in America who thinks that the United States can abandon its responsibility of world leadership without causing the gravest consequences to humanity, ourselves included? If we do not hold the torch of leadership and carry it forward, into whose hands will it fall? What other free nation is in a position to assume the burden or to carry the burden?

I do not disparage the brave people of any other country. The brave people of many free lands would gladly bear the burden. They would stagger along under it as best they could. But if America becomes weary of well doing as the leader of freemen, nobody will be responsible but the men who make the policies of this, our American Republic.

Let no man think that he can escape the direst isolationism if world leadership falls into the hands of the Soviet groups, and if they alone shall grasp the standard. They have the ground forces; they have atomic weapons; they have nuclear weapons. They are able to take the standard of leadership and carry it. If they carry it, the United States will become the great nation of isolationism, to which some people have had a nostalgic hope of returning some time, some way, some day. If that should come to pass, let me say that we will trade, not as free agents in the world, but as traders at sufferance. We shall be doing business as tenants at sufferance all over the world that can be controlled by the Soviet group, if our position of leadership in world affairs passes away.

Mr. President, I do not want it to be said that I was one to call for an isolated America, for a Western Hemisphere fortified as a garrison, which it must inevitably become if we do not retain our position in world affairs. I want it, rather, to be said that I never advocated that position.

The simple consequence of the leadership to which I have referred is that if we should here take action which could be construed as an abandonment of our position in world affairs, if we should recklessly rip this bill of all its substance, where would the leadership go? As I have already asked, if we here should cut the assistance planned for our allies in NATO, what would our allies conclude? Would they think we mean business? In that event, Mr. President, there could be a falling away from NATO that would be truly alarming.

#### STUDY OF FOREIGN AID

Early this spring, Mr. President, I suggested that the general subject of foreign aid should be subjected to searching examination by an independent, nonpolitical group, if possible. While I shall not be in the Senate next year, and thus benefit from the advice of such a group, it seems to me that it is essential, before this body again considers the subject matter of this bill, that it have the benefit of such advice as it may be able to get.

In the past few years there has been a breakdown in the understanding of the so-called foreign-aid program. Since those days when the American people willingly gave of their goods and services, to help Europe rebuild after the war, through the Marshall plan, the Turkish aid program, and the Greece aid program, there has been a deterioration of their understanding of the need for continuation of the Mutual Assistance Program. There is a deep skepticism among many of our people. They are not convinced that it serves our national interest to supply military assistance and economic assistance to our allies in Western Europe and Asia. Many believe the funds we here authorize for help to foreign nations should better be put to use in our own Military Establishment. They are not convinced that the national interest is served by continued economic assistance to many nations and peoples who are less fortunate than we are. There are many questions in the public mind as to the way in which such assistance—if it is to be continued—should be administered to serve the national interest.

Mr. President, I do not believe we should permit such doubts at this time to destroy this program, but I do believe that a survey should be made, and that we should find a better way of administering aid. That, in my opinion, is one of the weak points of this whole program.

I would not have anyone think that the Foreign Relations Committee has been without its own doubts and has been lacking in its own effort to improve constantly the condition of the American people and the American taxpayer. I very well remember that in fiscal 1951-52, the then President of the United States asked Congress for an appropriation of \$3,500,000,000 for foreign aid.

There were some of us who opposed that amount as being too large. We decreased the amount requested, but the actual appropriation made was \$7,300,000,000. The appropriations went down and down gradually, step by step, until last year the appropriation was only \$2,703,000,000, as I recall.

Mr. President, I very well remember that while I supported the NATO treaty, and supported it in good faith, I was called upon, within the short space of a few months, to oppose the first appropriation for NATO—the Senate at that time was sitting in the old Supreme Court chamber—because it was proposed to give to other nations some \$2 billion in money and in reconditioned arms and military equipment, without a single blueprint having been made without a single line having been struck across a single piece of paper, to indicate what would be done with the money. I knew that was unwise. I opposed it. I opposed it very strongly. I did not prevail. I recite these events for the purpose of showing that all the while there have been members of the Foreign Relations Committee who have been mindful of the burden placed upon our own people and of the desirability of lessening that burden when and if we could.

Mr. President, I do not believe we should permit our doubts, whatever they may be, to destroy the program at this time; but I do believe, that the questions in the minds of our citizens should be well and fully answered before this body is again asked to authorize the appropriation of funds for mutual security. No annual program of this size can be carried on without public acceptance by a substantial majority of our people.

As I have indicated, Mr. President, it is my belief, after careful and prolonged study of the mutual security program, that it serves the national interest of this Nation; that it serves it exactly in the same way that a strong army, a strong navy, and a strong airpower serve the national defense. It serves the national interest for exactly the same reason—because it enables us to keep more of our own manpower at work on consumer goods and on products which our people must have; and yet, in a defensive way, we have a strong position because we have air bases, and because we have foreign divisions who will fight with us. These foreign divisions have been built up and are now maintained at a cost to the American people, it is true, but, nevertheless, these forces, along with our own, are rendering a great service to our civilization, Mr. President. The American people must know that is the case.

Furthermore, there is need, in view of the changing nature of the world and the relationships of the great powers, for a reassessment of the emphasis, scope, and direction of the foreign-aid programs. Hence, early in the year I made the suggestion that a study be made; and I am happy to say the committee only recently has resolved, through the whole committee, to make a study of this problem in all of its ramifications.

Mr. President, it is my earnest hope that, despite the doubts of many Sen-

ators, all Senators will support the bill which has been reported to the floor of the Senate by the Committee on Foreign Relations, by a vote of 13 to 2. The good of our Nation will not be served by ignoring the advice of the President of the United States, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of State, and the other responsible officials of the executive branch, and the judgment of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee, who have thoroughly examined the measure now before the Senate.

Mr. President, whatever happens in the future, I know that the American people are not going to step backward. They may change administrations, they may change methods, and they may change whole programs; but they are not going backward, because, Mr. President, I cannot think that the divine providence which watches over all of us, and which has permitted us to become the responsible leaders of the world, would do so only to break that hope.

Whatever some may say about the low estate to which we have fallen, I know that if the free people of this globe lose confidence in us, we shall disappoint the best hopes of mankind, and we shall utterly fail to justify the sacrifices of our heroic dead, who have died in nearly all lands and have been swallowed up by the blue waters of nearly all oceans.

So, Mr. President, I submit this matter to the Senate. My colleagues on the committee will, of course, argue the matter at greater length than I have attempted to do in this statement.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 890) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

#### MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, all of us, I am sure, were deeply moved by the address of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. I know that I speak for all of my colleagues when I say that it is a great sorrow to all of us that he will not continue to be our

chairman after this year. The service he has rendered and the inspiration he has given have made it a privilege to serve with him. I wish to pay him this personal tribute of affection before I continue the discussion of the pending bill.

Mr. President, my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Georgia, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has given us a complete outline of the purposes of the pending Mutual Security Act of 1956, including the overall total authorization figures which the committee recommends in its report.

In opening my remarks to supplement those of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, I wish to emphasize, first, that this is an authorization bill as distinguished from an appropriation bill, and, second, that it is not a foreign-aid bill as is so popularly believed but rather a bill to insure the security of the United States, and every one of us, as well as our families.

What we do in this bill is to authorize the appropriation of funds to be available to the President to protect our security in case of any emergency that may arise in any part of the world.

The proposed cut of \$1,100,000,000 in the bill passed by the House is practically entirely a cut in the military authorization requested by the administration and the President himself. No one can deny that our great President is probably the most preeminently qualified person, due to his long career as a military man, to determine where the danger spots in the world are and what precautions we should take to prevent those danger spots from becoming enormous worldwide conflagrations which would inevitably threaten the security of the United States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I respectfully ask that I not be interrupted. I have a continuous presentation. I shall be glad to remain indefinitely to answer questions after I have concluded, but I prefer not to be interrupted while I am presenting this statement.

No one can deny that President Eisenhower is probably the most eminently qualified person, because of his long career as a military man, to determine where the danger spots in the world are at the present time, and what precautions we should take to prevent those danger spots from becoming enormous, worldwide conflagrations which would inevitably threaten the security of the United States. I emphasize that we are seeking an authorization for the President to enable him to watch for the danger spots, and to act when he needs to act to protect us all.

The President is supported in his conclusions and recommendations by the National Security Council, his close advisory body, but especially by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Admiral Radford, who is Chairman of the the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Also as far as West Europe, which means NATO, is concerned, we have the strong testimony of General Gruenther, who has been in charge of the NATO organization, and who urges that the figures contained in

the bill reported by the Senate committee be not reduced any further. The figures we have arrived at are the figures which the administrators feel they can live with.

This leads me to a consideration of the main objectives of our present foreign policy, as they are related to the bill now before the Senate.

#### AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Starting with the Democratic Truman administration after World War II and continuing through the Republican Eisenhower administration, we find that our foreign policy has been guided by two main considerations.

A. Military strength to deter aggression anywhere in the world. This is particularly true in an atomic age when a sudden attack with hydrogen bombs might destroy our entire civilization. This is what I have called the negative approach to our policy—the approach which might be paraphrased by the words "Thou shalt not." We must continue to develop this approach if we are to preserve our existence as a nation.

B. The other approach to which I wish to call attention, which is also a vital part of our foreign policy, and which is reflected in the bill, is our partnership aid to other peoples of the world. This is our positive program of international understanding. It involves the economic buildup of free peoples in a free world so as to insure peace and also to insure the security of the United States. It involves the overall conception of good will between peoples, which includes legitimate trade and international intercourse.

#### DEFINITIVE ACTION WE HAVE TAKEN TO IMPLEMENT OUR POLICY

Our foreign policy has grown out of our experience in World Wars I and II and the realization that we are living in a smaller world than heretofore and that the concern of any part of the world is the concern of every other part. Isolationism is no longer possible, as it was in the early days of our Republic. Let me consider briefly what steps we have taken to implement our policy of building strength to deter aggression.

##### A. STRENGTH TO DETER AGGRESSION

After both World Wars I and II we endeavored to find some way by which the collective strength of the world might be mobilized to prevent aggression and to prevent the use of war as an instrument of national policy. We recall, of course, the experiments of the League of Nations and its failures, and we also recall the building up of the United Nations as the successor of the League of Nations, and our hopes that this might be a means by which we could prevent the use of force. In spite of all the promise for positive accomplishments by the United Nations, and in spite of its important contributions, there remains a fatal weakness which has been difficult for us to overcome.

Mr. President, I may say parenthetically at this point that I recall vividly, when we voted to set up the United Nations, the thrill I felt on realizing that it represented a great step toward collective action to prevent future war. But

we are experiencing a profound feeling of sadness today that our hopes of that time have been temporarily sidetracked by Russian obstinacy.

The weakness in the U. N. has been the subtle and treacherous planning by Soviet Russia to obstruct any sincere efforts to obtain world peace. Russia was determined to follow the plan of divide and conquer. We found that Russia would obstruct every effort we made, as illustrated by the original Marshall plan, to bring recovery to a war-weary world. Russian obstructionism soon made us aware that we were dealing with a plan to overcome the world either by force of arms or by economic and political penetration. The Security Council of the United Nations became ineffective because of Russia's consistent use of the veto. Aggression which the free world desired to stop through the U. N. was permitted because of Russia's obstructionism.

We finally resorted to article 51 of the U. N. Charter, which permits and encourages within the U. N. the setting up of regional pacts by groups of nations for self-defense. This became a necessary method of security. It was part of the whole program of strength to deter aggression, and its operations are illustrated by NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization of Western Europe plus the United States; by the Rio Pact, which covers our Western Hemisphere; by the Southeast Asian Treaty Organization, SEATO, which covers Southeast Asia; by the so-called ANZUS Pact, which covers Australia, New Zealand, and the United States; by a number of bilateral pacts, particularly in the Far East, such as the pacts between the United States and Japan, the United States and the Philippines, the United States and Korea, and the United States and Nationalist China.

The so-called Baghdad Pact which has our full approval and support, should also be included, although we have not joined this pact because of certain sensitive situations in the area. The Baghdad Pact members are Turkey, Pakistan, Iran, Iraq, and Great Britain.

##### B. THE NONMILITARY BUILDUP OF FREE PEOPLES

Having reviewed the ways in which we have tried to build the strength against aggression which we feel we need for our own protection and for the security of the world, let me now consider the positive part of our policy—the nonmilitary buildup of free peoples.

The inception of this approach is what has come to be known as the Marshall plan for the economic recovery of Western Europe. We first had the ECA, which was purely economic and which was eminently successful in solving the problem of West Europe's dollar shortage and starting West Europe on the road to economic recovery. This economic program was of limited duration, and there has been criticism because when the first phase was terminated we found it necessary to extend military assistance to Western European countries to assist them to maintain their independence.

I recall very well that I was one of those who had said that after 3 years of the Marshall plan we would end the

program. I was sincerely hopeful that we could do it. However, there then came the Russian threats. Although we did end the economic part of the aid, we were compelled to organize further, through NATO, in order to protect the European countries against aggression. The original economic aid took on the military aspect because of the threat of Russian Communist aggression. This led to the buildup of NATO becoming an essential part of the double program. When Russia saw a barrier being built up against any possible military aggression in Western Europe, what did she do? She turned her attention to other parts of the world. This led to such outbreaks as the Korean aggression, which challenged the U. N.

Our experience in meeting this aggression in Korea led us to realize clearly once again that the objective of Soviet Russia was to take over the world. The free world was now threatened by the back-door approach through Asia. We saw the threat to the last stronghold of free China, namely, Formosa, by the buildup of Red China, which had been subtly conquered by subversive tactics and treacherous movements. We began to realize that the millions in overpopulated Asia who for centuries had been subject to some form of imperialism, or colonialism, were presently to become engulfed in a new form of colonialism, namely, Soviet totalitarianism.

We were challenged—and I wish to emphasize this point—with the fundamental issue of whether we would let these billions of people slide behind the Iron Curtain and lose all in the wake of what had been done in China, or, in the alternative, whether we would offer to those stricken and underdeveloped peoples the opportunity to obtain the freedom, independence, and self-determination for which they were fundamentally yearning. In my personal trips to the Far East and after talking to the leadership in practically all of the underdeveloped countries in the area, I personally became convinced that the best hope for world peace lay in endeavoring to understand this turmoil and to help these people to find the freedom from external control which they so longed for.

Under President Truman's point 4 program, and more recently under the wise and guiding policy of President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles, we have been experimenting with the kind of help that would be most appropriate to attain these objectives.

Many mistakes have been made, including many false starts, but the pattern is resolving itself into the kind of legislation that has appeared in the mutual security programs of recent years, known popularly as our foreign aid programs.

Briefly defined, as I stated above, this means that there are two parts to our present program:

First. Military security pacts, which I have described above, and the strengthening of our military position throughout the world by air bases, and so forth, which we have discussed during the past few days. This is what I have called the negative defensive aspect.

Second. The nonmilitary, namely, the buildup of underdeveloped countries and our attempt to help them attain their freedom, independence, and self-determination, so that they may become equal partners in a free world. This is the positive aspect of our assistance program.

Both of these aspects, the military and the nonmilitary, are provided for by the bill which we are asking the Senate to support.

Now let me get to the bill itself, the Mutual Security Act of 1956.

#### THE MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

This bill involves our consideration of the dollar authorizations for the fiscal year 1957. At this point I desire to urge upon my colleagues the importance of carefully studying the report of the committee, which explains the present evolution of our foreign policy and presents the dollar issues involved. I call attention particularly to page 2 of the report, which sets forth in parallel columns the original request of the administration, the action by the House, and the recommendation of our Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Let me analyze these figures briefly.

I am comparing now the administration request, the House action, and the recommendations of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The administration request was for a total of \$4,672,475,000, of which the military request was \$2,925,000,000 and the nonmilitary request was \$1,747,475,000.

The House action provided a total authorization of \$3,567,475,000, of which the military authorization was \$1,925,000,000 and the nonmilitary authorization was \$1,642,475,000.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee recommended a total authorization of \$4,270,075,000, of which the military authorization is \$2,525,000,000 and the nonmilitary authorization is \$1,745,075,000.

This means that the House in its action cut the military part—I emphasize the military part—of the program \$1 billion. The Senate committee cut the military part of the program \$400 million. In other words, the committee restored \$600 million of the total House military cut.

The House cut the nonmilitary part of the program by approximately \$100 million, but the Senate committee recommended substantially the same amount as the administration requested for the nonmilitary part of the program.

#### THE WORLDWIDE MILITARY PICTURE

This is what I have defined above as the first part of our overall foreign program and it involves the issues of adequate defenses to deter aggression.

In the program, as General Gruenther and Admiral Radford pointed out, it is necessary to bring the armed forces of the Western Powers up to date in the strenuous world competition. This applies especially to the NATO countries, accounting for \$530 million of the total. There are certain critical danger spots in the Far East. With these I am very familiar because I have studied them during the past 8 or 10 years.

In the military part of the bill, as I have stated before, the Defense Department and the President feel that we will

need authorization for \$2.52 billion as in the Senate version of the bill. If we cut an additional \$600 million below this amount as the House did, this cut must be made somewhere.

Let me analyze the situation. As I see it, there are certain "must" priorities in this military program:

(a) The program calls for \$530 million in so-called advance weapons to bring the armed forces of the Western Powers up to date in the strenuous world competition. This applies especially to NATO countries.

(b) There are certain critical danger spots in the Far East.

These are:

First. South Korea, where there is an uncertain armistice which is being constantly violated by the Communists and especially the Red Chinese in North Korea.

As we all know, we have withdrawn our own troops from South Korea. We have there a military assistance group to train the South Koreans. They are prepared to defend their own homeland if it should be further attacked, and they will bear the burden of any attack which may come.

Second. The Formosa area, where there has been an enormous buildup of Red Chinese strength opposite Formosa and immediately threatening the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. This is the area covered by the Formosa resolution of last year.

Third. Vietnam and the overall Indochina area: Here again is an uncertain armistice line and free Vietnam is constantly threatened by the Viet Minh which is supported by Red China and Russia and which threatens to take over all of Vietnam as well as Laos and Cambodia.

The amounts which are contemplated to be set aside for these three critical areas are strictly classified for security reasons. I may say to my colleagues however, that these amounts and the amounts privately earmarked for other countries of the world, while classified, are of course available to any Member of the Senate in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee.

It is estimated that these critical areas of the Far East, including Pakistan, are so demanding on our resources to keep alive and effective the manpower defending the front in these areas that any reduction in these funds might well require a complete change in our Far Eastern military policy.

If at this time we should say that we will do less for NATO, we would be giving notice that we are withdrawing from our responsibilities. It might appear that we were failing our allies at this time. As I have analyzed the figures, if we give priorities to the Far East, we will have to take any reductions out of the NATO figures.

Let me emphasize here that it is native Koreans who have been trained into an effective army in South Korea. It is native Chinese who have been trained for an effective defensive army in Formosa and it is native Vietnamese who have been trained to defend their homeland in Vietnam. Our boys are not now involved. It is in the interest of our own

security that we furnish the necessary resources to maintain these armies that are in the field and which are being trained by the United States in these areas.

The same is true of NATO. Admiral Radford and General Gruenther both point out that to maintain the military strength of NATO and possibly even its very existence it will be necessary for us to continue to support the assistance program which is recommended. Two billion fifty-two million dollars is the lowest figure that our military experts, including the President, feel we must authorize if we are not going to be compelled to revise our worldwide military program. Let me digress a moment to compare this military end of the pending bill and even the overall figures for the entire mutual-security program with our total defense budget that we have just approved our appropriation for in the Senate. As I said above, the military end of the bill is \$2.52 billion. The overall figure for the entire program, both military and nonmilitary, is \$4.27 billion. The total defense budget is over \$35 billion, plus the additional billion dollars we voted for airpower.

It is obvious that the foreign military support which our present policy calls for is a relatively small percentage of the overall total of our defense program. It is estimated that our foreign military support—that is, the \$2.52-billion Senate version—probably saves us at least 2 or 3 times what the cost to us would be without this foreign cooperation. On page 12 of the report there appears a chart which shows the relative contribution of the European NATO countries to NATO defenses and the United States contribution to NATO for the years 1950 to 1955, inclusive.

I invite especial attention to that, because it has been charged that we are carrying the load for the NATO countries. That is not true. The bulk of the expenses are carried by the countries with whom we are trying to work.

My conclusion on this part of the bill, therefore, is that it is vitally important for us to help to develop foreign security alliances and foreign manpower to aid in the defense of the free world. The expense is stupendous, I admit, even though it is but a small percentage of our overall defense picture. But the alternative seems to be a complete withdrawal from all security pacts and again a return to isolationism in the Western Hemisphere.

My colleague, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], pointed out most eloquently what it would mean if we had to withdraw from the world and to leave the world outside our own hemisphere to Soviet Russia. This, to me, is unthinkable in this modern age of hydrogen bombs.

I turn, now, to the nonmilitary side of the bill and what its provisions entail.

This is what I call the positive approach to our foreign policy. So far as the amounts involved are concerned, the differences are relatively small. The administration request is for \$1.74 billion plus. The House bill calls for \$1.64 billion plus and the Senate committee recommendation calls for \$1.74 billion

plus. The Senate recommendation is, therefore, approximately the same as the administration's request. The House, on the other hand, deducted from the administration's request approximately \$100 million beyond that figure, which, as I say, is relatively small compared with the \$35 billion appropriated yesterday for our overall defense at home.

A question may arise as to whether this nonmilitary assistance is justified at all.

The Marshall plan countries, as the Senator from Georgia has pointed out, have, generally speaking, made such advances in their economic recovery that they need no economic aid from us this year. We provided them with such aid when they needed it; and although their political recovery is not clear, their economic recovery is. The main economic problem is in the underdeveloped areas of the world, especially in the Far East and the Middle East, in Africa, and, to some degree, South America.

Let me emphasize why I believe a nonmilitary aid program should have our support. I myself feel that this should be continuing support, as the President has requested. This does not mean continuing substantial grants, but, as the Senate bill contemplates, it means support in the way of loans, so as to help these people to solve their economic problems. We should give evidence that we are willing to assist these countries to be free and independent, and especially to help them to determine their own future destinies. To sum up briefly my position on this matter, I submit the following:

First, this partnership policy supplements military preparedness and collective security.

Second, it must have a more human and more universal objective than merely the prevention of the spread of communism. I wish to emphasize that we must aim to do more than merely to prevent the spread of communism. We must have a broader approach. We must determine how people can be brought into friendly relationships and thus, ultimately, to bring about world peace.

Third, our primary nonmilitary objective should be as friendly partners, to help fulfill the aspirations of people in the underdeveloped countries for freedom, independence, and self-determination, and higher standards of living. This does not require large dollar handouts, but loans and technical assistance.

If we could only get away from the need for military expenditures, we would be amazed at the ranges of assistance and the ranges of human understanding which could be opened up by simply helping many of these people to raise their standards of living, and to become self-sufficient members of the free world.

Fourth, if we can do this effectively, we can meet the threat of communism with its recent "smiling" promises. Bulganin and Khrushchev have recognized clearly what we have been doing. Now they are offering inducements from their own standpoint which they think will lure those people into the Soviet field.

Fifth, from my personal experience the people in these so-called underdeveloped countries are yearning to break away from the old imperialism and

colonialism, and to be recognized as free and independent, without any form of external control.

Sixth, they are eager to learn the know-how of real government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Seventh, stated in another way, our primary nonmilitary objective might well be human, man-to-man contact with peoples who really wish to be free and who wish to know what brought freedom and liberty to the people of the United States.

Let me add that our own security will only be assured and the world can only be at peace if we do our part in helping to raise the standard of living in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

So I find myself in entire accord with the inspiring and noble words of my colleague, the Senator from Georgia. From my own experience of 10 years on the Committee on Foreign Relations, and from my trips to Europe and, especially, to the Far East, I have observed at first hand the yearning for freedom and independence which those people legitimately have.

Our ancestors came to this country because they sought to be free. They realized the possibilities of men being free. They realized the possibilities of releasing the creative energies of mankind, in order that mankind might express itself with the deepest emotions of the human spirit. Our ancestors realized that there is a God who is directing the destinies of His people. They realized that this Nation had been blessed by Almighty God. Our forefathers were blessed with the ideal of bringing to the people of the world a new conception of life, a conception never before known.

We have demonstrated by our freedom and our institutions of self-government that man can be protected against the encroachment of totalitarianism and dictatorship, and can be protected, really, against himself.

It seems to me that we are justified in continuing the policy which has evolved from our experience since World War II into a program, first, of strength against possible destruction, and second, of maintaining and improving our relationships with the people of the other countries of the world, so as to afford them the opportunity to secure for themselves the greatest blessings which we in America have enjoyed. I believe that is, for us, both a responsibility and an opportunity.

It is my sincere hope that the United States Senate will pass the bill as reported by the committee, and will support the authorizations which the committee, after a careful study of all the figures and facts presented to it, has seen fit to include in the bill.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Sen-

ate to the bill (H. R. 9720) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of June 27, 1956, pp. 11125-11126, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as was announced by the clerk of the Senate, the report was signed by all the conferees on the part of the Senate, both the majority and the minority, and is now before the Senate.

This bill, H. R. 9720, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, as it passed the Senate was for \$2,372,523,281, an increase of \$75,541,500 over the House allowance, and \$8,637,881 over the budget estimates.

The bill as it is now before us following the House adoption of the conference report and its acceptance of the Senate amendments affecting the National Institutes of Health, reported in disagreement, carries a total of \$2,366,380,781, a decrease of \$6,142,500 under the Senate allowance, an increase of \$69,399,000 over the House allowance, and \$2,495,381 over the budget estimates.

Amendment No. 3 provided for an increase of \$48,500 for the Bureau of Labor Standards, with respect to which the report, No. 2093, had this comment from our committee:

The Bureau has developed, the committee was advised, in the current year a model workmen's compensation law and circulated this draft among the States last November. There has been sufficient time to conclude this project, and the Department should finalize its conclusions based upon the work heretofore done and with funds heretofore provided, and make a report to the Congress.

The Senate conferees in receding from the action of the Senate increasing the funds \$48,500 did not retreat from the position taken by the committee as set forth in the report just quoted, and the Department is expected to bring to a termination work on the model workmen's compensation law. As is pointed out in the report, sufficient time has elapsed for the exchange of views between the Department and the States with respect to the model law circulated last November and the committee contemplates the termination of the work on this particular project within a very short time.

The Senate had provided an increase of \$313,000 for the Bureau of Labor Statistics to allow the full budget estimate of \$7 million. In conference the managers on the part of the Senate were forced to compromise and accept \$200,000, of which \$150,000 may be used for a special survey of wages and hours in the

retail trade and \$50,000 for extension and improvement of the State-Federal program for the collection of injury-rate data.

There was a great deal of interest in the Senate with respect to the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, Office of Education," for which we had an estimate for \$6 million, but for which the House had allowed only \$4,500,000. An additional \$500,000 was added in the Senate, and the Senate amendment was accepted by the conferees. The House in its report on this item specifically directed that \$675,000 be used for research on the problems of the mentally retarded children, and the Senate had specifically directed that a total of \$817,905 of the increase over 1956 funds be allocated to certain work. The conference agreement provides sufficient funds over the 1956 appropriation to permit the effecting of both directions, and leaves approximately \$250,000 for use in the discretion of the Office of Education, except that the conferees were in agreement that none of the funds could be used for the library.

The Senate had provided an increase of \$260,000 to allow the full budget estimate for sanitary engineering activities, and to make the full amount sought available for air pollution work. The Senate conferees were unable to gain even a compromise on this amendment and were forced to recede.

The Senate provided an increase of \$19 million for grants for hospital construction, approving a total of \$130 million, of which \$107,800,000 was for grants under the original Hill-Burton program, compared to the House allowance of \$111 million, of which \$88,800,000 was for the original Hill-Burton program. The conferees agreed upon a compromise figure of \$125 million, of which \$102,800,000 is for the original Hill-Burton program. This allowance has been exceeded only once, in fiscal year 1950, when the full amount authorized, \$150 million, was made available.

The Senate had provided an increase of \$100,000 for the Children's Bureau, to make available the full amount requested for work in the juvenile delinquency program. The Senate conferees were unable to gain even a compromise on this amendment, and were forced to recede. The managers on the part of the Senate strove to salvage at least something from this amendment, but our efforts were unavailing.

The conferees were unable to reach an agreement on amendments 31-38, inclusive, providing additional funds for the several accounts under the National Institutes of Health, for which the Senate had provided total increases of \$48,912,000, for a total of \$184,437,000, an increase of \$82,279,000 over the current year's funds. The amendments were reported in disagreement to the House, and a motion was made by Mr. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, chairman of the House conferees, to recede and concur in our amendments, a motion which was adopted.

Our committee report gave fairly explicit directions with respect to the use of the increases recommended, and later

approved by the Senate, and the National Institutes of Health will be expected to observe our suggestions and directions, and to obligate funds only in accordance with the justifications and with the instructions from the committees as set forth in the reports accompanying the bill when reported.

The amounts approved for the National Institutes of Health represent an increase of 80.54 percent over the current year's funds. This is by far the largest amounts ever appropriated for health research, of the total appropriation, less that amount provided for construction of surgical facilities, 73.05 percent will be used for the extramural program—for grants for research and training purposes—a total of \$133,544,000 for grants to research institutions, to hospitals, to medical schools and to individual scientists.

There have been expressions of doubt as to whether such increases could be prudently and wisely expended in medical research. The committee had advice and counsel from eminent doctors and scientists who were of the opinion that such sums as have been approved could be prudently and wisely spent in the coming year on medical research.

The committee expects to have these research programs followed closely to secure periodic and frequent lay reports on progress.

Mr. President, there was a great deal of interest in the Senate with respect to the appropriation for the Office of Education, and particularly with reference to the amendment offered by the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], an amendment in the amount of \$500,000. I am happy to advise the Senate, as the Senator from Minnesota so well knows, that the House conferees agreed to accept the amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the agreement to the requested funds for research was possibly one of the greatest steps that has even been taken in furnishing funds for research activities in the field of health. I wish to say to my colleagues that the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], was a powerful factor not only in convincing us on the Senate side—he did not have to convince me—but in convincing all those concerned that the fund could be properly used for research activities. He certainly was a very potent factor in convincing the House conferees that there was a need for such funds, and that the research funds could well be used throughout the Nation to hurry the day when we shall have complete knowledge of how to deal effectively with cancer and heart disease, as well as to extend ourselves into the unknown field concerning mental disease and research in mental diseases. So I again commend the Senator for the very excellent job done in having the requests for the funds accepted.

Mr. HILL. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his

very kind and generous comments, and also to say that there was no one who was more interested in having the figures adopted than was the Senator from Minnesota. He has been a longtime member of the committee, and was former chairman of the subcommittee, and during that time he has always urged funds to be used for research in health problems, and, as he mentioned, for research into cancer, heart disease, mental illness, arthritis, metabolic diseases, neurological diseases, blindness, microbiological diseases, including tuberculosis, and many other diseases. The Senator from Minnesota was a strong factor in behalf of the adoption of these figures.

Mr. President, I am proud of the fact that as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia a few years ago I successfully insisted on the appropriation of funds for the fluoridation program for the District of Columbia.

I also wish to discuss the progress of dental research, and the attitude of the Senate toward this area of investigation. Based upon testimony from highly qualified witnesses, the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations has consistently recommended increases in funds for dental research, and has also suggested, based again on competent scientific advice, that the field of dental research be considered as involving the whole array of physiological processes and systems which affect dental health and dental disease.

Splendid progress is being made. For this reason the Senate proposed that \$6,026,000 be appropriated for dental research and related activities in fiscal year 1957. This contrasts with \$3,471,000 in the House allowance and \$2,971,000 in the President's budget. The House voted to accept the Senate figures.

One of the most important factors affecting the desire of the Senate to see an expansion of dental research has been the discovery that fluoridation of water at optimum levels will curb the formation of cavities in the teeth without doing any harm to the people who drink the water. The long, tedious, and comprehensive research that resulted in this discovery and in means of applying the discovery as a public-health measure is an inspiring story.

Together with millions of Americans, I am grateful for this discovery.

The responsibilities of the Public Health Service in regard to fluoridation are quite clear. Not only should they continue research in this field, but also they should make the facts about fluoridation known to State and local health agencies. They also have the obligation to provide, upon request, technical assistance in the application of this important public health advance.

There are those who dispute the facts, or who, for a number of reasons, reject fluoridation of water supplies. These people are entitled to their opinions, and each community has the right—which we must zealously uphold—to decide for itself whether its water supply will be fluoridated. However, the decision should be based on knowledge rather than on misinformation and misunderstanding.

It is essential, therefore, that the Federal Government be free to pursue its investigations and report the results of its investigations. This is as true of community water fluoridation as it is of all scientific investigation.

In fact, the Government would be gravely remiss in its obligations if it failed to disseminate the results of its studies because the results might arouse criticism or cause public controversy. This would undermine the very foundations of scientific research. Freedom is the essence of science—freedom to pursue leads, to study the facts and evaluate the evidence objectively, to publish the findings—no matter what they reveal. I, for one, would be satisfied with nothing less, whether the subject of research be cancer, mental illness, or water fluoridation.

In this connection, I should like to clarify a point in the report of the committee which has given rise to some misinterpretation. I am sure the Members agree with me that the Federal Government must continue its traditional role of disseminating scientific facts through publication of articles, speeches, exhibits, and responses to requests by State and local authorities for technical advice and assistance. Nothing in the report of the committee should be construed as placing any limitation on this function or of providing information which will be of help to States and local communities in determining whether or not they should adopt community water fluoridation as a public health measure. Nothing in our committee report should be so interpreted. On the contrary, we believe the results of scientific research should be disseminated as widely as possible, and that it is an obligation of officials of the Public Health Service to assist in spreading knowledge scientifically arrived at.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter to me from the Surgeon General be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,  
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,  
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1956.

EON. LISTER HILL,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: Senate Report No. 2093, page 22, on the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill, 1957, contains the following statement:

"The committee was advised that less than \$40,000 would be used in connection with fluoridation, and that only for studying the effects of its use."

This statement apparently relates to the research grant program alone, under which it is true that somewhat less than \$40,000 is currently being expended in support of projects relating to fluoride metabolism and water fluoridation. Inasmuch as the committee may have been provided with inadequate or misleading information, I should like to bring the following facts about the dental program to your attention.

In addition to these research grants and without taking into account the laboratory studies in this field conducted under the intramural program of the National Institute of Dental Research, the Public Health Service

has four other important programs in the water fluoridation field. They are:

1. Approximately \$21,000 is expended annually on two study projects concerned with developing practical, efficient methods of removing excessive fluorides from water, so that the fluoride concentration may be adjustable downward to the optimal level of 1 part per million. These studies are being carried out in Bartlett, Tex., and Britton, S. Dak., where the natural fluoride concentrations are 8 parts per million and 7 parts per million, respectively.

2. Approximately \$25,000 is expended annually on the Grand Rapids project, now in its 12th year of operation. This study, in which sodium fluoride is being used as the fluoridating chemical, is a primary demonstration of fluoridation in the reduction of dental caries.

3. Approximately \$12,000 is expended annually in the Public Health Service's Montgomery County, Md., fluoridation study, where sodium silicofluoride is being used. This study is providing data for a comparative analysis of the effect of sodium fluoride and sodium silicofluoride as fluoridating chemicals.

4. Approximately \$23,000 is expended annually in laboratory and field investigations directed toward simplifying the tests for fluoride concentrations in drinking water and devising a system for automatically and continuously recording fluoride concentration.

Thus the figure cited in the Senate committee report is conspicuously low and does not represent an accurate estimate of the Public Health Service's investment in studies and programs related to the effect of the use of fluoride in public water supplies.

Inasmuch as fluoridation is only part of a well-rounded dental public health program, it is most difficult to estimate the proportion of consultative time or funds devoted to this segment of the Public Health Service's dental activities. Nevertheless, it can be estimated that less than 5 percent of the total Public Health Service appropriation for dental health is devoted to activities which, in the very broadest sense, can be interpreted as promotional in character, consisting largely of advice and assistance to States and communities on technical matters relating to the fluoridation procedure.

Since more than three-fourths of the total appropriation for dental health activities is for the support of laboratory and clinical research activities at the National Institute of Dental Research, for grants to universities and research institutions throughout the Nation, and for the coordination of dental resources, it seems clear that the numerous protests from citizens alleging that virtually all of the dental health funds of the Public Health Service are being used to promote water fluoridation are not in accordance with the facts.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD A. SCHEELE,  
Surgeon General.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks an article prepared by Dr. J. Roy Doty, secretary of the American Dental Association's Council on Dental Therapeutics, regarding water fluoridation.

Dr. Doty's statement is a concise disposition of arguments raised by anti-fluoridationists and was prepared for presentation to the Senate Appropria-

tions Committee in connection with the 1957 appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. Through inadvertence, the statement did not reach the Senate Appropriations Committee in time to be printed with the hearings on the appropriation bill, and at the request of the American Dental Association I am pleased to request unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IRRESPONSIBLE OPPOSITION TO FLUORIDATION

(By J. Roy Doty, Ph. D., secretary, Council on Dental Therapeutics, American Dental Association)

It is unfortunate that every advance in public health brings to light a group of crusaders who are determined to save the public from the imaginary dangers of the new public health procedure. Even today, in spite of the many years' experience with chlorination of water supplies and pasteurization of milk, and in spite of the innumerable lives that have been saved and the tremendous improvement in public health resulting from these procedures, there are still some individuals trying to save the public from the hazards of chlorination and pasteurization.

Today, with the widespread interest in fluoridation and the dental benefits which it has been shown to provide, a flock of so-called experts can be found who are opposing fluoridation just as vigorously as chlorination was opposed 30 years ago by the same type of individual. Since scientific fact has a way of eventually penetrating the barriers of confusion and misinformation, there need be no concern for the ultimate acceptance of fluoridation.

It is unfortunate, however, that thousands or even millions of the younger children of today could be denied the dental benefits of fluoridation because of the lies and half-truths being disseminated by a relatively small but vocal group which is apparently dedicated to the perpetuation of misinformation.

Since the general public is ordinarily not in a position to evaluate technical statements and does not have ready access to the medical and scientific literature which describes the studies bearing on fluoridation, many persons are particularly susceptible to flamboyant charges by irresponsible individuals who manage to surround themselves with an aura of expertness, and, like Don Quixote, manage to find innumerable windmills which threaten the health, sanity and well-being of the American public. It is unfortunate that these individuals must be dignified and given further publicity through the necessity of correcting the misinformation which they are spreading.

Many opponents of fluoridation use the old propaganda trick of attempting to inflame emotions through the use of a name which is expected to be distasteful to a large number of individuals. The author of the article attempts to convey the impression that fluoridation is simply a scheme which the former Federal Security Administrator attempted to foist on the public by means of the United States Public Health Service. He therefore conveys the impression that this was another line in the attempt to sell the public on the scheme of socialized medicine. These implications may be contrasted with the actual fact that studies of the dental significance of the fluorides began many years before the Federal Security Agency came into being. It is important to note also that two organizations, namely the American Medical Associa-

tion and the American Dental Association, that led the fight against the Federal Security Administrator's proposal of compulsory health insurance have both endorsed the fluoridation procedure. Thus, instead of being a visionary political scheme, fluoridation is shown to be a carefully considered recommendation of conservative professional organizations. Many authors of anti-fluoridation articles continually hammer away with the big lie technique. Thus we have a repetition of the old charge that there has been little study of the various factors relating to the safety of fluoridation. Contrast this charge with the fact that about 5,000 titles of scientific articles bearing on the physiological effects of fluorides appear in the list<sup>1</sup> which was compiled at the Kettering Laboratory at the University of Cincinnati School of Medicine. It is especially noteworthy to observe that nature herself demonstrated the safety of fluorides at the recommended level of approximately one part per million by providing a huge laboratory in numerous sections of the United States where several million persons have, for many years, used drinking waters which contain varying amounts of fluoride up to a level as high as 14 parts per million. In no instance has anyone demonstrated undesirable effects except with regard to mottled enamel in those areas where the fluoride concentration is distinctly higher than that recommended in controlled fluoridation.

One of the apparent causes of apprehension in the minds of the uninformed individuals is the fact that large quantities of fluoride are toxic. Many individuals, without a background in pharmacology, will therefore infer that even in small amounts fluoride must also be toxic.

It will perhaps allay the apprehension of many to know that a number of substances which are essential parts of our everyday diet, such as vitamin A and vitamin D, are toxic when consumed in concentrated form, and in large, uncontrolled amounts. Thus toxicity is not only a matter of what material is consumed but also of how much is consumed.

It is suggested that each individual answer for himself the following question: Which of the following groups is more likely to have reliable information regarding the effectiveness and safety of fluoridation: (1) professional organizations in the health field, including the American Medical Association, the National Research Council, the American Public Health Association and other similar groups, or (2) food faddists, purveyors of so-called health foods, publicity seekers and writers of sensation articles, together with a very few members of the health professions? In this latter connection it should be remembered that out of approximately 216,000 physicians and 94,000 dentists and several hundred thousand other scientists, it is not remarkable to find a dozen or so rep-

resentatives who oppose fluoridation largely on the basis of the idea that the proponents of fluoridation should be willing to guarantee that no harmful effect, however insignificant, will ever result from this procedure. One may pose the rhetorical question: Can anyone guarantee that any individual's most trivial activity may not sometime result in injury? Can any scientist therefore be honest and be willing to provide such a dogmatic guarantee? When millions of people for many years have used drinking water bearing one part per million of fluoride without any evidence of adverse effect and when dozens of careful animal tests show that fluoride must be consumed at levels at least 50 to 100 times this high before toxic effects (other than mottled teeth) can be detected, then the public can know that the statement, "There is no evidence that fluoride in water at one part per million will have any undesirable effect," is an adequate assurance of safety.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the result of the conference between the two Houses.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Appropriation title	Appropriations, 1956	Estimates, 1957	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference agreement
<b>TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR</b>					
<b>OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	\$1,677,850	\$1,767,000	\$1,751,000	\$1,767,000	\$1,751,000
<b>OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,812,400	2,080,000	2,021,000	2,021,000	2,021,000
<b>BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	866,500	1,000,000	911,500	960,000	911,500
<b>BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	383,000	383,000	383,000	383,000	383,000
<b>BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	3,350,800	3,445,000	3,399,000	3,399,000	3,399,000
<b>BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	5,350,350	5,765,000	5,558,000	5,558,000	5,558,000
Grants to States.....	250,000,000	265,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000
Unemployment compensation for veterans.....	105,067,250	90,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000
Unemployment compensation for Federal employees.....	33,000,000	30,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
Mexican farm labor program.....	1,957,000	2,125,000	1,888,000	2,125,000	2,125,000
Total, Bureau of Employment Security.....	395,374,000	392,890,000	352,446,000	352,683,000	352,683,000
<b>BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,317,500	2,353,000	2,347,000	2,347,000	2,347,000
Employees compensation fund (indefinite).....	[48,000,000]	{ Annual indefinite	{ Annual indefinite	{ Annual indefinite	{ Annual indefinite
<b>BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	6,407,000	7,000,000	6,687,000	7,000,000	6,887,000
<b>WOMEN'S BUREAU</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	371,000	403,000	403,000	403,000	403,000
<b>WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	8,143,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Total, Department of Labor.....	420,703,650	421,321,000	380,348,500	380,963,000	380,785,500
<b>TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE</b>					
<b>AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND</b>					
Education of the blind.....	224,000	230,000	230,000	230,000	230,000
<b>FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION</b>					
Salaries and expenses (general).....	6,144,000	5,779,000	6,779,000	6,779,000	6,779,000
Salaries and expenses (certification and inspection services).....	[1,160,050]	{ Annual indefinite	{ Annual indefinite	{ Annual indefinite	{ Annual indefinite
<b>FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,980,000	2,755,000	2,755,000	2,755,000	2,755,000

<sup>1</sup> Kettering Laboratory, Department of Preventive Medicine and Industrial Health, Col-

lege of Medicine, University of Cincinnati. Classified bibliography of publications con-

cerning fluorine and its compounds in relation to man, animals and their environment.

Appropriation title	Appropriations, 1956	Estimates, 1957	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference agreement
<b>TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued</b>					
<b>GALLAUDET COLLEGE</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	\$548,000	\$615,000	\$615,000	\$615,000	\$615,000
Construction.....	2,225,000	2,547,000	2,547,000	2,547,000	2,547,000
<b>Total, Gallaudet College.....</b>	<b>2,773,000</b>	<b>3,162,000</b>	<b>3,162,000</b>	<b>3,162,000</b>	<b>3,162,000</b>
<b>HOWARD UNIVERSITY</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	3,090,400	3,410,000	3,300,000	3,410,000	3,300,000
Plans and specifications.....		150,000		75,000	
Construction of buildings.....	122,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Liquidation of contract authority.....	2,008,600	286,200	286,200	286,200	286,200
<b>Total, Howard University.....</b>	<b>5,221,000</b>	<b>3,946,200</b>	<b>3,686,200</b>	<b>3,871,200</b>	<b>3,686,200</b>
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>					
Promotion and further development of vocational education.....	26,210,000	26,500,000	29,267,081	29,442,081	29,442,081
Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts.....	2,501,500	2,501,500	2,501,500	2,501,500	2,501,500
Payments to school districts.....	90,000,000	79,000,000	79,000,000	79,000,000	79,000,000
Assistance for school construction.....	33,900,000				
White House Conference on Education.....	428,000				
Salaries and expenses.....	3,240,000	6,000,000	4,500,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
<b>Total, Office of Education.....</b>	<b>156,279,500</b>	<b>114,001,500</b>	<b>115,268,581</b>	<b>115,943,581</b>	<b>115,943,581</b>
<b>OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION</b>					
Grants to States and other agencies.....	33,750,000	37,000,000	35,000,000	37,000,000	37,000,000
Training and traineeships.....	2,075,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,950,000	2,950,000
Salaries and expenses.....	1,058,000	1,337,000	1,160,000	1,260,000	1,160,000
<b>Total, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.....</b>	<b>36,883,000</b>	<b>41,087,000</b>	<b>38,910,000</b>	<b>41,210,000</b>	<b>41,110,000</b>
<b>PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE</b>					
Assistance to States, general.....	18,376,000	14,186,000	14,186,000	16,461,000	16,461,000
Grants to States for polio vaccination.....	57,800,000				
Veneral diseases.....	3,616,000	3,640,000	3,640,000	4,140,000	4,140,000
Tuberculosis.....	6,062,000	6,375,000	6,375,000	6,625,000	6,625,000
Communicable diseases.....	5,451,000	5,210,000	5,210,000	5,210,000	5,210,000
Sanitary engineering activities.....	4,880,000	6,260,000	6,000,000	6,260,000	6,000,000
Buildings and facilities, Cincinnati, Ohio.....	415,000				
Disease and sanitation investigation and control, Territory of Alaska.....	1,139,000	1,145,000	1,145,000	1,145,000	1,145,000
Hospital construction grants.....	111,600,000	130,000,000	111,600,000	130,000,000	125,000,000
Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services.....	1,290,000	1,419,000	1,381,000	1,381,000	1,381,000
Hospitals and medical care.....	35,396,000	35,811,000	35,661,000	35,811,000	35,796,000
Foreign Quarantine Service.....	3,170,000	3,245,000	3,245,000	3,245,000	3,245,000
Indian health activities.....	34,816,000	38,125,000	38,125,000	38,125,000	38,125,000
Construction of Indian health facilities.....	5,000,000	8,762,000	8,762,000	8,762,000	8,762,000
National Institutes of Health:					
Operating expenses.....	5,929,000	11,922,000	11,922,000	11,922,000	11,922,000
National Cancer Institute.....	24,978,000	32,437,000	34,437,000	48,432,000	48,432,000
Mental health activities.....	18,001,000	21,749,000	23,749,000	35,197,000	35,197,000
National Heart Institute.....	18,898,000	22,106,000	25,106,000	33,396,000	33,396,000
Dental health activities.....	2,176,000	2,971,000	3,471,000	6,026,000	6,026,000
Arthritis and metabolic disease activities.....	10,840,000	13,345,000	13,845,000	15,885,000	15,885,000
Microbiology activities.....	7,775,000	9,799,000	8,799,000	13,299,000	13,299,000
Neurology and blindness activities.....	9,861,000	12,196,000	14,196,000	18,650,000	18,650,000
Construction of surgical facilities.....				1,630,000	1,630,000
Construction of animal facilities.....	510,000				
Construction of Biologics Standards Laboratory.....	3,190,000				
Subtotal, National Institutes of Health.....	102,158,000	126,525,000	135,525,000	184,437,000	184,437,000
Gorgas Memorial Laboratory.....	147,000	147,000	147,000	147,000	147,000
Retired pay of commissioned officers.....	1,355,000	1,450,000	1,450,000	1,450,000	1,450,000
Salaries and expenses (Office of the Surgeon General).....	3,090,600	3,210,000	3,172,000	3,172,000	3,172,000
<b>Total, Public Health Service.....</b>	<b>395,161,000</b>	<b>385,510,000</b>	<b>375,024,000</b>	<b>446,371,000</b>	<b>441,036,000</b>
<b>ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,644,000	2,737,000	2,737,000	2,737,000	2,737,000
Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds.....	600,000	270,000	270,000	270,000	270,000
Construction, maximum security building.....	269,000	6,821,000	6,821,000	6,821,000	6,821,000
<b>Total, St. Elizabeths Hospital.....</b>	<b>3,513,000</b>	<b>9,828,000</b>	<b>9,828,000</b>	<b>9,828,000</b>	<b>9,828,000</b>
<b>SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION</b>					
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.....	[91,229,000]	[97,711,000]	[97,000,000]	[97,000,000]	[97,000,000]
Construction, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.....	[3,870,000]				
Grants to States for public assistance.....	1,447,000,000	1,315,000,000	1,300,000,000	1,300,000,000	1,300,000,000
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance.....	1,636,250	1,748,000	1,698,000	1,748,000	1,748,000
Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau.....	1,740,000	1,922,000	1,822,000	1,922,000	1,822,000
Grants to States for maternal and child welfare.....	34,156,600	35,288,700	39,361,000	39,361,000	39,361,000
Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner:					
Appropriation.....	184,400	212,000	212,000	212,000	212,000
Transfer from OASI trust fund.....	[138,600]	[160,000]	[160,000]	[160,000]	[160,000]
<b>Total, Social Security Administration.....</b>	<b>1,484,717,250</b>	<b>1,354,170,700</b>	<b>1,343,093,000</b>	<b>1,343,243,000</b>	<b>1,343,143,000</b>
<b>OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY</b>					
Salaries and expenses (immediate Office of the Secretary):					
Appropriation.....	1,483,500	1,588,000	1,588,000	1,588,000	1,588,000
OASI transfer.....	[211,500]	[225,000]	[225,000]	[225,000]	[225,000]
Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Administration:					
Appropriation.....	1,908,400	2,030,000	1,985,000	1,985,000	1,985,000
OASI transfer.....	[427,000]	[526,200]	[500,000]	[500,000]	[500,000]
Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel:					
Appropriation.....	398,900	426,000	426,000	426,000	426,000
Transfers.....	[419,900]	[419,100]	[419,100]	[419,100]	[419,100]
Surplus property utilization.....	425,000	475,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
<b>Total, Office of the Secretary.....</b>	<b>4,215,800</b>	<b>4,519,000</b>	<b>4,449,000</b>	<b>4,449,000</b>	<b>4,449,000</b>
<b>Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....</b>	<b>2,098,111,550</b>	<b>1,925,988,400</b>	<b>1,903,184,781</b>	<b>1,977,341,781</b>	<b>1,972,121,781</b>

Appropriation title	Appropriations, 1956	Estimates, 1957	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference agreement
<b>TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	\$8,800,000	\$10,215,000	\$8,951,500	\$9,101,500	\$8,951,500
<b>TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	460,000	470,000	435,000	460,000	460,000
Arbitration and emergency boards.....	225,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
National Railroad Adjustment Board, salaries and expenses.....	502,000	525,000	502,000	502,000	502,000
Total, National Mediation Board.....	1,187,000	1,245,000	1,187,000	1,212,000	1,212,000
<b>TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD</b>					
Salaries and expenses (trust fund limitation).....	[6,988,000]	[7,308,000]	[6,493,000]	[7,000,000]	[7,000,000]
Military service credits.....		1,711,000			
<b>TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	3,284,000	3,390,000	3,295,000	3,390,000	3,295,000
Boards of inquiry.....	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Total, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	3,294,000	3,400,000	3,305,000	3,400,000	3,305,000
<b>TITLE VII—INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN</b>					
Federal contribution.....	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
<b>TITLE VIII—SOLDIERS' HOME</b>					
Maintenance and operation.....	[4,537,000]	[5,364,000]	[6,564,000]	[6,564,000]	[6,564,000]
Grand total, all titles of bill.....	2,532,101,200	2,363,885,400	2,296,981,781	2,372,023,281	2,366,380,781

#### EXTENSION OF EXPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1949—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9052) to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 28, 1956, p. 11283, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the conferees on the Export Control Act extension have agreed to a provision concerning the required survey of iron and steel scrap, which, I think, meets the objectives of both Houses.

The House bill required the Secretary of Commerce to make this survey, and required that he use only full-time employees of the Department. The Senate amended this to direct the Bureau of Mines to make the survey, but placed no restriction on the use of outside research organizations.

Both of these provisions were designed to insure an impartial and objective survey. The provisions were considered necessary because it was felt, first, that the "without compensation" employees from the steel companies in the Business and Defense Services Administration could not properly be charged with responsibility for a survey of such direct interest to their private employers; and

second, that there was a danger that some private research organization might be selected to assist in the survey which, by reason of work done for one of the parties to the controversy or positions already taken on the subject, might not be in a position to make an impartial and objective survey to serve as a basis for decisions by the Congress and the Secretary of Commerce.

The conference bill places the survey in the hands of the Secretary of Commerce, and it permits the use of private research organizations. It prohibits without compensation employees from participating in the survey in any manner. It was the understanding of the Senate conferees, and was emphasized in the statement of managers on the part of the House, that this prohibition is intended to be applied broadly. These industry-paid employees are not permitted to participate in the preparation, formulation, or scope of the survey, in the selection of any private research organization to assist, or in the formulation of the conclusions and recommendations drawn from the survey. The selection of a private research organization was left to the Secretary of Commerce—subject to the prohibition on the participation of without compensation employees in the decision—in the belief that it was appropriate to rely on his judgment for selection of an organization or organizations which would be impartial and unbiased. The Statement of the Managers on the Part of the House emphasizes this responsibility of the Secretary:

It is of the utmost importance that the survey be completely fair and objective. Accordingly, the Secretary of Commerce must exercise the greatest caution to insure that any research organization selected to assist in the survey shall be completely impartial and unprejudiced.

The interim report of the Secretary of Commerce, and the final report, will be reviewed to determine whether he has carried out this responsibility to the full

satisfaction of all interested parties. We cannot emphasize too strongly that this survey will be worse than a waste of money if its results and conclusions are not completely above reproach.

In my judgment, the conference bill will fully protect the public interest.

In view of expiration of the Export Control Act of 1949 on June 30, 1956, I urge that the Senate approve the conference report promptly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

#### EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9852) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 28, 1956, p. 11284, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the clerk made the statement that the conference report had been signed by all the conferees. I believe that one conferee on the part of the Senate did not sign the conference report.

Mr. ALLOTT. I ask the Senator which one.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is the only one who did not sign the conference report. I think that is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President—

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Senator from Arkansas has informed the minority leader of the taking up of the conference report.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We informed the conferees yesterday that we would take it up as soon as possible, because the act will soon expire. However, if the Senator from Texas does not wish to have the conference report acted on at this time, that will be perfectly acceptable to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest that further consideration of the conference report be postponed until the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] can be notified.

Let me inquire whether all the conferees have signed the report.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All, I believe, except the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Did the Senator from Connecticut indicate that he would oppose adoption of the conference report?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He did not so suggest to me. However, it will be quite all right with me to defer the further consideration of the report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understood there was complete agreement with everyone concerned. However, the minority leader did not inform me of that. Therefore, I suggest that the minority leader inform the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and that in the meantime we proceed to the consideration of other matters.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me say that in the Senate the two votes on the measure were overwhelming, and I really do not believe that the Senator from Connecticut intends to oppose the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. ALLOTT. Probably that is correct, Mr. President; but we shall appreciate it if further consideration of the report can be deferred until we are able to clear up this matter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That will be quite satisfactory.

Mr. FULBRIGHT subsequently said: Mr. President, let me say that I now understand that the conference report has been cleared with the leadership.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it is satisfactory to the minority to have action taken on the conference report at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the report.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement with respect to the conference report on the Defense Production Act.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT, H. R. 9852

The conferees on the Defense Production Act extension had five problems to consider.

Two technical amendments—the change of date for the interim report on the nickel survey to August 15 and the payment of expenses of the Joint Committee on Defense Production out of the House contingent fund—were accepted without question.

The House conferees accepted the Senate amendment eliminating the requirement that members of the executive reserve must file in the Federal Register statements of their financial interests. This result, in my judgment, will preserve the executive reserve program.

The House conferees also accepted the Bennett amendment relating to dispersal, with an amendment substituting the word "encourage" for the word "promote." The Senate conferees, supported by the two overwhelming rollcall votes of the Senate on this amendment, pressed this amendment most vigorously. It is, I think, no overstatement to say that this amendment was the subject of considerable discussion in the conference.

Also in disagreement was the amendment proposed in committee by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] relating to allocations in the civilian market. The amendment was directed principally to the nickel situation.

The present system constitutes in fact an informal voluntary agreement between the Department of Commerce, the International Nickel Co., and the few other minor producers, and the distributors of nickel to platers and other small users. It is clear that International Nickel has agreed to carry on under the same arrangement which the old MPA had previously used. This is a very curious arrangement in which the Government through the Department of Commerce apparently concurs in the assignment by International Nickel Co. of a quota to each of its customers. On the one hand, the Government appears to lend its authority and approval to this arrangement; and, on the other, it assumes little or no responsibility for the consequences. It is my belief, and it was the will of the committee in the adoption of the Morse amendment, that if there are to be controls, they should be formal controls so that consumers, particularly small ones, would know the rules and have an orderly method of presenting their cases to their governmental representatives.

The present arrangement is not free competitive enterprise nor is it freedom from Government controls. Every nickel user in the country knows that he is subjected to controls by the International Nickel Co.

If such controls are necessary, they should be run in an open, public way by Government orders, printed in the Federal Register, so that all who are affected can know what is being done, with a formal procedure established for protests and appeals and with lawful penalties for violations.

Our committee's amendment was not mandatory in the sense that it required Government controls. However, it did require that the President take responsibility for a situation which is created by Government action, because of the fact that the Government is now taking approximately 40 percent of nickel production.

I regret that the House conferees did not accept our amendment. However, it was agreed by the conferees that the present situation is inadequate and unsatisfactory. I think this fact is clearly indicated in the statement of the managers on the part of the House, which appears at page 11284 of

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 28. It was also made apparent by the fact that the bill, as agreed upon by the conferees, and in fact as passed by both Houses, includes provision that a special study of the nickel situation be undertaken by the Secretary of Commerce in consultation with the Joint Committee on Defense Production.

It is also made clear and it was agreed by the conferees that existing provisions of the Defense Production Act give the President ample authority to impose allocation controls on either a general or selective basis to alleviate this problem.

In my opinion the administration now has a positive duty to reexamine the present arrangement with the International Nickel Co. and to take full responsibility for the system now existing, or to revise it in a manner which will be more equitable and straightforward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON CERTAIN UNPATENTED MINING CLAIMS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2386, Senate bill 3773.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3773) to provide for an extension of the time during which annual assessment work on unpatented mining claims may be made, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the word "claim", to strike out "located and filed under the provisions" and insert "validated under section 2", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the time during which labor must be performed, or improvements made, pursuant to the provisions of section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (30 U. S. C. 28), on any unpatented mining claim validated under section 2 of the act of August 11, 1955 (Public Law 357, 84th Cong., 69 Stat. 679), for the period commencing July 1, 1955, is hereby extended until the hour of 12 o'clock meridian July 1, 1957.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, action on the bill is urgent, in order that it may become law by the 1st of July, in order to correct a misunderstanding which arose as a result of a telegram sent by the Bureau of Land Management.

The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The bill has departmental approval, and it is very urgent that the bill be passed this afternoon. It extends the time for completing the work on a certain class of uranium claims, under a bill passed last August by the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for an extension of the time during which annual assessment work on unpatented mining claims validated under section 2 of the act of August 11, 1955, may be made, and for other purposes."

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, today the majority policy committee considered approximately 50 bills and other measures now on the calendar, and cleared them for consideration by the Senate, to be called up or brought up by motion at the discretion of the majority leader. They are as follows:

Calendar No. 235, S. 300, Fryingpan-Arkansas project.

Calendar No. 2045, Senate Resolution 250, limiting the number of sponsors on Senate legislation.

Calendar No. 2135, S. 374, extending the statute of limitations for false statements by Government employees.

Calendar No. 2140, S. 3617, permitting State laws to be effective in the fields of subversion and sedition.

Calendar No. 2156, H. R. 7225, Social Security Act amendments.

Calendar No. 2163, House Joint Resolution 501, authorizing United States participation in NATO parliamentary conferences.

Calendar No. 2168, H. R. 10285, to merge production-credit corporations into farm Federal intermediate-credit banks.

Calendar No. 2252, S. 3143, establishing rules of interpretation for questions arising in the field of Federal-State concurrent jurisdiction legislation.

Calendar No. 2256, H. R. 9842, authorizing the Postmaster General to impound certain obscene mail for temporary periods.

Calendar No. 2284, S. 3704, authorizing the purchase of land for an extension of the new Senate Office Building.

Calendar No. 2298, S. 1333, Hells Canyon Dam project.

Calendar No. 1511, H. R. 3653, amending the Tariff Act with respect to amorphous graphite.

Calendar No. 1987, S. 3457, transferring certain land to Pierce County, Wash.

Calendar No. 2039, S. 3449, airlines capital-gains bill.

Calendar No. 2285, S. 3743, adding certain land to the Lassen Volcanic National Park in California.

Calendar No. 2021, S. 1907, declaring certain lands to be held in trust for Indians in New Mexico.

Calendar No. 2292, H. R. 10230, increasing the minor coinage revolving fund.

Calendar No. 2295, Senate Concurrent Resolution 79, reprinting A Handbook for Americans.

Calendar No. 2297, Senate Joint Resolution 165, relinquishing consular jurisdiction in Morocco.

Calendar No. 2299, H. R. 5256, providing for redemption of migratory-bird hunting stamps.

Calendar No. 2302, H. R. 9823, transferring certain lands to the Kanosh Indians, in Utah.

Calendar No. 2304, S. 3665, permitting homesteaders to make single final proof in Alaska prior to survey.

Calendar No. 2305, H. R. 8552, granting certain easements to Chincoteague, Va.

Calendar No. 2306, H. R. 5657, permitting certain land in Florida to be used for civil-defense purposes.

Calendar No. 2307, S. 976, conveys certain land to the city of Montgomery, W. Va.

Calendar No. 2308, S. 3404, conveys certain land to Virginia.

Calendar No. 2309, S. 3998, to develop a Federal fish hatchery in Vermont.

Calendar No. 2310, S. 1384, providing for the return of certain mineral interests in land acquired for flood-control purposes.

Calendar No. 2311, H. R. 9952, providing lump-sum readjustment payments for involuntarily separated reservists.

Calendar No. 2312, S. 3820, increasing the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Calendar No. 2313, S. 3903, amending the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act.

Calendar No. 2314, S. 2634, amending the laws governing highway post-office service.

Calendar No. 2315, H. R. 10766, authorizing payment of compensation for certain war damages.

Calendar No. 2316, S. 4011, authorizing the creation of a Coast Guard supply fund.

Calendar No. 2317, H. R. 4652, authorizing conveyance of certain lighthouses to the Panama Canal Company.

Calendar No. 2318, H. R. 5147, increasing congressional distribution of coast and geodetic survey charts.

Calendar No. 2319, H. R. 6245, authorizing Panama Canal Company to convey certain land to the State Department.

Calendar No. 2320, H. R. 6850, creating an academic advisory board for the Merchant Marine Academy.

Calendar No. 2323, Senate Joint Resolution 139, providing for a Commission to Commemorate the 50th Anniversary of the First Conference of State Governors.

Calendar No. 2324, S. 1087, authorizing aftercare payments for juvenile prisoners.

Calendar No. 2374, S. 2017, to prohibit the misuse by collecting agencies of Federal agency names and insignia.

Calendar No. 2375, S. 2891, to prohibit the use of the initials "U. S." by certain business firms.

Calendar No. 2388, H. R. 9893, military-construction bill.

I wish to have that statement printed at this point in the Record, so that all Senators, may be on notice that these measures have been considered by the majority policy committee, and that the leadership expects to bring them up by motion at the conclusion of the unfinished business and during next week.

I desire to announce again that next week the Senate will not be in session on Wednesday, but will be in session on

Monday and Tuesday. Although we do not anticipate that there will be a great deal of controversial proposed legislation before us, there may be yea-and-nay votes on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, or Friday of next week.

#### PROTECTION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY OUTSIDE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Cotton in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1275) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate employees of the District to protect life and property in and on the buildings and grounds of any institution located upon property outside of the District of Columbia acquired by the United States for District sanitoriums, hospitals, training schools, and other institutions, which were on page 2, line 3, after "jail", to insert "": *Provided*, That such employee shall be bonded for the faithful discharge of such duties, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall fix the penalty of any such bond"; and on page 2, line 17, after "weapons", to insert "and shall wear such uniform with such identification badge."

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

#### MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, having been in almost constant attendance during the past 9 weeks while the Committee on Foreign Relations compiled a hearing record of more than 1,000 pages in connection with its consideration of the Mutual Security Act of 1956, I propose to address myself briefly to some aspects of the pending legislation.

Most of the testimony received by the committee was presented by representatives of the Department of State, the International Cooperation Administration, and the Department of Defense. In addition, the committee received the testimony of all those individual Americans and representatives of various private organizations who asked to be heard either in support of, or in opposition to, the President's proposals.

On the basis of all this voluminous testimony, I have come to the conclusion that the bill reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations should be supported. An appraisal of my past record in the Senate will reveal that I have generally supported the foreign aid bills of both Democratic and Republican administrations, and yet I have reached the conclusion to support this year's bill both in the committee and on the floor, only after a good deal of soul searching.

In the past my decisions have frequently been based on the assumption that the thousands of State Department,

International Cooperation Administration, and Defense Department officials abroad have been in a position to give the President and the Secretary of State the kind of information and advice they need to formulate a foreign policy calculated to advance consistently the interests of the United States.

In short, it has been my theory in the field of foreign policy that, if in doubt, I should support the President. I shall do so this year, as I have done in the past.

I cannot let the record rest there, however, because I must express my candid view that this year my doubts are greater than ever before. The coherence and rationality of the program are so open to question that I am close to the border of opposition. So that the record may be clear, I wish to indicate some of the reasons why I have been greatly concerned with foreign policy developments during the past year.

At the committee hearings on the pending legislation, I asked witnesses time after time to define the terms they used so freely, and I am sure there have been occasions when I have pushed my questions to the point where some witnesses may have wished I would stop my questioning.

In insisting that such terms as "defense support," "economic development," "long-term commitments," "flexibility," and others should be clearly defined, it was my purpose to find out if the witnesses had thought through their testimony. I must say that I found more evidence of loose language than of tight language—more evidence of loose thinking than of clear thinking. This disturbed me deeply, because I believe it is incumbent on the executive branch to be clear when it seeks to have Congress authorize annual programs involving billions of dollars. As disturbing to me as the lack of clarity in thinking was the apparent absence of perspective in planning the pending legislation.

One of my colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee some months ago, when the program was first presented to the Congress, remarked that this year's mutual-security bill looked like some more of the same old medicine in the same old bottle.

I have not had a great deal of experience with bottled medicine. Nevertheless, it is my impression that if the medicine prescribed is getting results, it ought not to be lightly discarded. However, if a man's symptoms have changed and the old medicine is not getting results, the time has come for a fresh diagnosis.

In the case of our foreign-aid programs, the symptoms of the world's situation today are quite different from those of the past year. Moreover, there is substantial doubt whether the old medicine is getting the results we have the right to expect. Thus, while the actions of the Soviet Union have undergone marked changes since last July, there is little evidence that the administration has shown the flexibility in thinking, and the clear thinking, necessary to meet these fresh challenges. We still hear the oft-repeated phrase with which the administration reacts to new Soviet moves.

When the Soviet Union announces a reduction in its armed forces, what do we say? We demand "deeds, not words."

When the Soviet Union proposes assistance to the nations of Asia, what do we say? We demand "deeds, not words."

When the Soviets suggest that exchanges of persons between the United States and the Soviet Union be stepped up or that their leaders visit this country, what do we say? We demand "deeds, not words."

I do not wish to be misunderstood as taking the position that the Soviet Union has changed its fundamental aims or that we should accept at face value the new look. The Soviet Union is still a totalitarian dictatorship, whether the dictatorship be that of Stalin or a committee of successors. The Soviet Union still threatens freemen everywhere.

But I do make the point that the Soviet Union's new tactics have an influence in neutral countries which we cannot counteract with automatic slogans. There is no doubt that the Soviet Union is making friends and influencing peoples by its actions. The peoples and the governments of many Arab and Asian nations believe that the Soviet Union is engaged in performing "deeds"; but all we do is to reply with the old sluggish, outmoded slogan, "Deeds, not words." Unless we show more originality of thought, more good old Yankee initiative in our foreign policy, we will find our own words hurled back in our teeth.

During this year, when Soviet actions have been undergoing a transition, the administration has been marking time. There is little evidence that it has comprehended the fact that world relationships are changing, that a fresh diagnosis of world relationships is needed, and that such diagnosis may require new action on the part of the United States.

The people of this Nation feel that things are not right with our foreign policy. They hear the reassuring words of the President but read in the press of our deteriorating international relationships. In the words of the nursery rhyme, the people are realizing that "it isn't the whistle that pulls the train." We cannot rock along in the same old fashion relying on slogans and preachments instead of action and expect free nations to admire us for our leadership and be willing to tie up their future with ours.

Never in my experience as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations have I seen so many amendments offered in the committee to a proposal submitted by the administration. No less than 15 amendments were proposed, many of them going to matters of substance. Furthermore, the committee this year received from the public more proposed revisions of the Mutual Security program than it has ever received before. This is evidence of the widespread and growing concern of our people. There is a vast uneasiness about the quality of our foreign policy. This is not election-year uneasiness. It is an uneasiness bred of the feeling that American influence is being diluted by aggressive Soviet advances on the political and economic fronts. It is an uneasiness compounded by a gradual reali-

zation that our reactions to the new Communist threats are unimaginative, stereotyped, and negative in quality.

My remarks thus far, Mr. President, have been directed to the foreign policy implications of this proposed legislation. There is one domestic aspect of the problem which has given me deep concern also, namely, the fact that some of the involved language in past legislation has seemed to hide the fact that much of the Mutual Security program has been used to modernize our own Armed Forces. In this connection, I invite the attention of my colleagues to that provision of the pending legislation which relates to the authorization of funds for military assistance. I am especially interested in this provision because it was my privilege in the Committee on Foreign Relations to offer an amendment which was accepted and which will, I believe, serve to increase the understanding of the people of the nature of the program being carried on under this legislation.

In the past, Mr. President, the military assistance funds have been appropriated to the President of the United States. Those funds have then been used in large part by the administration to purchase equipment from the Armed Forces of the United States. That equipment is then given to the nations which we assist.

What actually has been happening, however, is that when these Mutual Security funds are used to buy, for example, an F-84 jet fighter to be given to country X, the Air Force, which sells the jet fighter to the Mutual Security people, uses the funds received to replace the F-84 with a later model aircraft—perhaps an F-104. In effect, then, a substantial part of the funds made available for what some people call "foreign aid," has been used to modernize the arms in the possession of our own Armed Forces. Indeed, the Armed Forces of this Nation have been charging the Mutual Security funds not for the price of the F-84 in my example, but they have been charging the price required to replace it, namely, the price for the F-104. The present Mutual Security Act, however, will change that situation.

I sought by the amendment which I presented in the Committee on Foreign Relations to make it clear that a large portion of the funds we here authorize are used in the way I have described and thus serve far more directly the national interest than many had supposed.

If my colleagues will note section 3 of the pending bill, they will see that it authorizes the appropriation of a total of \$2.5 billion. My amendment divides that total into two parts.

First, there is the figure of \$925 million. That amount may be used for military assistance of the type which will, for the most part, involve direct purchases for the mutual-security account. Thus, for example, if the President should determine to supply advanced-type rockets or guided missiles to one of our allies in Western Europe—missiles or rockets of a type not in supply in the United States in sufficient quantity to serve our own interests much less our allies too—he could order such equipment for the country we would be assisting and have it de-

livered. Such a purchase would come from this sum of \$925 million.

However, the second part of the military assistance fund, the larger part of \$1.6 billion is to be used—and I quote from the language of the section—"only for the purchase of equipment and materials for the Armed Forces of the United States." The section also provides that to the extent this sum of \$1.6 billion is used for these purchases, a corresponding value of equipment may be furnished from Department of Defense stocks to countries receiving help under our mutual-assistance program.

In other words, Mr. President, what this language does is to make it crystal clear with respect of some two-thirds of the military assistance funds hereby authorized, that it is to be channeled into assistance to foreign nations only if it is processed through our own armed services in such a way as to enable our own armed services to have first claim on the latest, most modern equipment from our own manufacturers. The amendment, I believe, removes a cloud under which much of this program has operated, namely, the belief that somehow this military-assistance program was being operated to the detriment, indeed, to the damage, of the military defenses of this Nation.

These, Mr. President, are some of the reasons why I have had doubts about supporting the pending legislation. These are some of the reasons I view the pending legislation as a mark-time operation—a holding operation—while we diagnose and reassess a foreign policy which, though it may appear strong in defensive tactics, is weak in initiative.

I have heard that the administration is engaged in a reappraisal of the whys and the wherefores of our mutual-security program. I earnestly hope that such reappraisal will be objective, that the assumptions upon which our aid programs of the future must be based will be sound, and that our future actions may be bold and thus consistent with the character of our people.

The American people have the deserved reputation for honesty, ingenuity, and boldness. We have acquired a reputation throughout the world of being a haven for the oppressed, a nation dedicated to promoting self-government and individual freedom, and a nation of economic opportunity. However, this great reputation built by our forefathers is gradually being dissipated. We voice our sympathy for the oppressed, but we have largely closed our borders to them. We talk of self-government and independence, but we permit ourselves constantly to be allied with colonialism against independence. We talk of equality and independence of nations and of economic opportunity, but we are niggardly in helping so-called neutral nations unless they accept the ties of our apron strings. I have every respect for efforts to be prudent and careful in expenditures for aid. Frugality, however, ought not to degenerate into miserliness.

Mr. President, I support the pending bill as an interim measure because I have every hope that by this time next year we will have developed an approach to mutual security which will reflect the

image of the real America. We are not by nature a fearful, defensive people. For that reason our foreign policy should not be couched in the negative terms of fear of communism.

It is not true, as many have suggested, that Congress will only support a foreign-aid program if it can be shown that foreign aid is necessary to fight communism. Programs of economic assistance must not be based on the negative concept that such aid is necessary only to prevent some nation from going Communist. I do not believe that most independent nations are motivated nearly so much by the fear of going Communist as by the positive desire to promote individual freedom and economic growth for their people.

The independent nations of Asia which we help are not nearly so interested in what the United States is against as in what the United States is for. It is a simple thing to be against evil, but it is a tremendous challenge to promote good. The truth is, of course, that the promotion of good is likely to have most serious setbacks to evil, but that must be the collateral effect, not the prime purpose.

I hope that the administration by next year will be able to approach Congress asking authority for foreign aid in positive rather than negative terms. Our country will not be able to grasp the initiative until our energies are devoted to promoting freedom instead of being sapped by the slogans against communism wherever it seems to threaten.

In the formulation of a fresh approach to foreign aid, I hope the administration will be honest with itself. We often hear reference to the man who looks at the world through rose-colored glasses or to the man who looks at the world through dark glasses. In both cases the way he sees things is conditioned by the glasses he puts on. He sees the world as he wants to see it. This characteristic of many men is most dangerous if applied to governments. When I read statements in the press one day that all is right with the world and that the United States has never been held in higher esteem, and the next day read reports that tragedy faces us if we do not speed up the arming of our friends, I become fearful that we see the world not as it is but as we want it to be, through rose-colored glasses one day and dark glasses the next.

In "Hamlet," the words "This above all—to thine own self be true," are especially applicable to governments. It is especially incumbent upon the leaders of a nation to be honest with themselves and with the people, as they analyze the foreign policy interests of this Nation and the factors which influence foreign nations and peoples in their attitudes toward us.

Finally, Mr. President, I ask that the administration be bold and forthright in presenting our foreign-policy problems to the Congress and the people. There must be no assumption that if a problem is serious it must somehow be made to look simple, that it must be sugarcoated, else the people will not respond. The American people view problems as challenges. Our history has shown that we are capable of rising to the needs of the

hour once those needs are made clear. I believe this generalization is applicable to the conduct of this Nation in its foreign relations as well as in dealing with its internal problems.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say I am hopeful that the doubts which I expressed at the beginning of my remarks are exaggerated. I may have been too pessimistic and too critical in these remarks. However, I am hopeful that the lack of a fresh and forward approach to meet new challenges to which I have drawn attention is only a part of the democratic process of government—a process which is often slow and painful, but ultimately determined and productive. So, as I stated in the beginning, I have concluded that here and now I should vote to support the bill reported by the Foreign Relations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE MORAL CRISIS IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a short time ago in a nationwide television broadcast, Secretary of State Dulles talked to the American people. He invited full and fearless discussion on all questions concerning our foreign policy.

It is not often that a Cabinet officer of the party in power asks for advice, debate, or criticism of the policy he adopts and the Department he administers.

Secretary Dulles showed courage in this proposal, especially as we are about to enter a great presidential campaign. But the Secretary realizes that the campaign, dramatizing personalities and issues, captures the attention and interest of millions of Americans. It provides an excellent opportunity to discuss our foreign policy, appraise its successes and its failures, and reach the solid conclusions on which vigorous action can be based.

Of course, there must be self-restraint.

Our discussion must be carried on with a sincere desire to arrive at the truth and at the best interest of our people. We must not seek small partisan advantage. Our criticism must not be carping and destructive, but rather clear and constructive.

In this discussion we must be free of party discipline and executive dictation. We must honestly, courageously face the issues—admitting past mistakes, whether they have been made by Republicans or Democrats. This is in the best American tradition of public service.

Our duty during the course of the campaign in the convention halls, meeting places and on the street corners throughout the Nation, is to discuss our international problems fully and frankly. Our allies and opponents must understand that we are dedicated to the task of preserving the free world.

How we conduct our foreign policy, and whether we successfully handle the issues confronting us, will determine not only the fate of Americans now living, but also the fate of generations to come—and perhaps the fate of the civilized world. It is because of these awesome pending decisions that I ask for a searching examination of our foreign policy—what it is and what it should be to serve our people best.

I think we might well spend a few moments reviewing the fundamentals and thereby clear the air. Let us see whether we can determine the essentials for a foreign policy that would truly and effectively advance our national interests.

So much has been written, so much has been said, and the confusion becomes so great, that we have lost sight of the simple and obvious fact. That fact is that the purpose of our foreign policy is to promote and protect the true interests of our people. No one will deny this simple statement of purpose, and yet we become involved in incredible confusions.

The real interests of our people: What are they? The ideals of the Republic: What are they?

Our real interests are the preservation of our freedoms—our way of life. As individuals, we want to realize our greatest possibilities, morally, spiritually, economically; to live in decency and to raise our families in the best traditions of our free society. As Americans, we want to be citizens of a republic which provides a government under a constitution which guarantees those rights.

Because of war and circumstance, the United States has become the leader of the free world. The power of example is of overwhelmingly critical importance. To the extent that we are determined to maintain our own freedom, our friends and allies will be disposed to follow our example.

As Americans, we want to remain free to live according to our democratic traditions—to work, to hold property, to raise our families, to live in our town, city, State, and Nation, free from the danger of attack and foreign conquest.

By foreign conquest I do not merely mean military conquest. I also mean intellectual and spiritual conquest. The time has passed when only men's bodies are conquered. We now live in a world where the dictators are as much interested in the conquest of men's souls and minds as that of their bodies and their land.

Real security, which was once defined in only military terms as being freedom from the danger of armed invasion, has a wider meaning now. Security now means not only physical defense against our enemies. Security now also means defense against spiritual and intellectual demoralization.

I am as much concerned with our moral and spiritual security as I am with our military security. We are nearly all cognizant of our military security. Needless to say, our military security presents serious problems, but most of us are alert to these problems. Once aware and alerted, I have great confidence in American technological skill, American economic know-how, and American re-

sourcefulness. These talents are a great asset in building a military defense.

It is with the moral and spiritual side of our problem that I am greatly concerned. I do not say Americans are morally weak. I do say we are morally confused. Nowhere is this moral confusion worse than among our so-called liberal intellectuals. This confusion tends to paralyze the mind and the will. The more extended the paralysis, the greater is the Communist victory.

There are moral questions on which we cannot be neutral. The recognition of physical torture as a deliberate instrument of government, the employment of secret police, the use of summary trials and executions behind closed doors, the dragooning of forced labor—these and other practices of tyrannical despotisms behind the Iron Curtain have been abhorrent to our people.

Yet these practices are a commonplace in Communist states.

Right now we are being told that some mysterious and inexorable law of history and economics is remaking the conduct of the Russians. Things are going to be different.

How different? In what way?

The "purported" speech of Khrushchev before the 20th Communist Party Congress was reported at length in the New York Times for June 5, 1956—just a few days ago.

Said Khrushchev, recounting the gruesome methods of the Stalin regime:

When the cases of some of these so-called "spies" and "saboteurs" were examined, it was found that all their cases were fabricated. Confessions of guilt of many arrested and charged with enemy activity were gained with the help of cruel and inhuman tortures.

He continued with instance after instance of these horrors. He spoke repeatedly of trials in secret, of what he calls "illegality," and so forth.

What does he mean by the words "secret" and "illegality"?

This man, engaged in denouncing Stalin for these crimes, is the most prominent member of an oligarchy which, since it has come to power, has been doing the very things of which Stalin is now accused. Beria, the chief of the secret police, was not the only man the present regime sent to death. We do not know how many there were. We do know, however, that a few weeks ago the news was permitted to leak out that four lieutenants of Beria had been tried in secret and shot. Is this what is called "legal"? Is this what is called "open trial"?

I say we have no evidence whatever to prove that the leopard has changed his spots.

Only a short while ago Khrushchev and Marshal Bulganin paid a visit to Britain. While they were there, they were entertained at dinner by Labor Members of Parliament. When the dinner was over the time came for questions. At length, one of those present addressed Khrushchev and said that there was worry and concern in Britain over the fate of a number of Social Democrats who had been imprisoned or had disappeared in Eastern Europe. Would Mr. Khrushchev be so good as to receive a

list of names and furnish, at his convenience, information about these Social Democrats? According to the press dispatch descriptions of the dinner, Khrushchev turned livid with rage. He brushed aside the list of names and said:

Why should I take a list of names when I have no idea whatever of paying any attention?

Are we going to give way, here a little, there a little, to people of this stripe? There was once a British Minister who went to Munich to get what he called "peace in our time." You know what happened.

Are we to ignore and pass over and rationalize these things?

I say we cannot if we have any moral principle left. We cannot if we act on moral principle at all.

Whatever our faults, whatever grievous blunders our people have made in the past, the belief in freedom has been—and, I believe, remains—the spark of our national conscience. This belief in freedom is what shores up the demand for "Equal justice under law." In some of the darkest moments of our history, it was this belief that carried us through. Over and over again the declarations of this conscience have been given to the world and, what is more, have been made to stick.

Recall the phrases:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

There is no neutralism or indecision here.

Yet again:

With a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor.

And once more:

That government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

These are expressions of moral principle and I could quote a hundred more. Every last one an expression of honorable American tradition, down to the historic rejoinder of General McAuliffe at Bastogne. There is no neutralism about them. They are the enduring evidences of the determination of Americans to keep their freedom.

We can exercise self-restraint, I hope, in our international relations. We can respect the rights of other nations. We can understand the yearning of colonial peoples for their freedom, because we ourselves were a colonial people once upon a time. We can refrain from meddling with the traditions and religion and customs of others. We certainly do not want to say "Do it our way, or else."

But, by the same token, we cannot tolerate the systematic effort of Moscow to impose communism upon nations and peoples who do not want it. That is what the Kremlin has been doing for decades. Here a murderous coup d'etat as in Czechoslovakia. There a wrecking job done by infiltration as in Indochina. To suppose that the piecemeal absorption

of other countries by the Communists is of no direct concern to us is insane.

Let us never forget that not a single one of the countries and half-countries now under Russian domination ever asked for it. Remember that even the Russians themselves have never had a chance. I said never. In their earliest times they lived in slavery. Then, they endured the bloodthirsty rule of the Mongols. In place of that, they became serfs under the absolute autocracy of the Czars. Then, in 1917, the faint flickers of a democratic revolution were snuffed out when a handful of Bolsheviks hijacked control and set up the dictatorship of the proletariat.

We know that Russians have been brave. We know that their endurance seems inexhaustible. But no Russian now or ever in the past has known what freedom is.

From East Germany to North Korea and North Vietnam, the peoples of the Red empire were given no real choice. They were beaten down and trapped by methods ranging from propaganda, subversion, and infiltration, to military violence or the threat of military violence. And, once trapped, by whatever means, their captivity has been maintained by unlimited terror.

Those self-styled liberals who defend the "right" of the Russians or Czechs, the Chinese or North Vietnamese, to go Communist are talking nonsense. They might just as logically defend the right of inmates of concentration camps to be slaves. The captive peoples did not "go" Communist—they were driven into the Kremlin's prison of nations, hermetically sealed against escape.

Let us never forget, also, that the Red Empire is not limited to the countries already behind its iron and bamboo curtains. Every Communist Party in what remains of the free world, every false-front organization operating under Moscow discipline, every guerrilla warfare contingent under Communist direction, is an integral part of the Red Empire. We are not dealing with a group of conventional nations, but with a worldwide conspiracy dedicated to making this one world—one Communist world.

The necessity of international political life makes it necessary for foreign offices, including our State Department, to treat Soviet Russia as if it were "just another country," but we know it is nothing of the sort. In reality, Soviet Russia, its satellites, and its allies are the core of an apparatus of power and coercion which penetrates in varying degrees, every nation on every continent of this earth.

On the one hand, the dictators in the Kremlin are the bosses of a great domain; on the other, they are the bandit leaders of a vast revolutionary conspiracy which seeks to destroy not only opponent states, but moral values, religion, freedom, all that we hold dear.

When Comrades Khrushchev, Bulganin, Malenkov, and Mikoyan, stage state visits beyond the Soviet frontiers, they pose as merely the heads of one country. The pose, unfortunately, is accepted at face value. Yet only the most befuddled can be unaware that these despots are at the same time the heads

of a world revolutionary movement. Their every word and act is related to a firm and fixed strategy of world domination. When they are abroad, no matter how plausible their pretext, they are reconnoitering enemy areas which they are determined to seduce or bludgeon into the Communist sphere.

Nothing that has happened since the death of Stalin has changed the overriding Communist commitment. The so-called return to Leninism, which is to say, to the original Bolshevik principles, is being foolishly interpreted in some quarters as a policy of moderation. Actually, it is a reaffirmation of Lenin's militant dogmas of class war, civil upheaval, and unlimited deception, all directed to the achievement of a totalitarian, all-Communist world.

So why the new optimism? Why the disastrous letdown of our vigilance?

If only our optimists today could be induced to do their homework in Communist history they would realize that in the middle thirties, under cover of Stalin's pretenses of live-and-let-live united fronts, the Soviets forged the weapons of subversion and infiltration which they exploited to the full when the "line" was changed.

They would recall how generally it was then accepted that communism had "matured," that it had ceased to be interested in world revolution, that Stalin the realist was concerned only with improving conditions in his own country. Those who tried to warn the world that communism had not changed its nature, but was temporarily employing cunning instead of brute force, were denounced as "Red-baiters" and alarmists.

Yet today we are neck-deep in the same confusions and illusions, as if the 1930's had never been. In order to soothe our nerves and our conscience, we are fed with fairy tales about "new looks" in the Communist world and the magic of collective leadership.

I am tired of this kind of talk, and I am especially tired of being told that I am an alarmist. I am no Johnny-come-lately in watching the Communist pitch curves at the so-called liberals.

How well do I recall that during World War II we were being swamped with stories about how completely the Communists had changed, and how we were all going to dwell in peace and unity after the war. We were going to remake the world and usher in the golden age.

I did not believe it. I could see no fundamental change in Communist tactics at all.

I said so in an interview with the Boston Herald on September 12, 1943. I said:

It is time to use more spine and less servility on this subject (of dealing with the Soviets). Joseph Stalin needs to be dealt with toughly, frankly \* \* \* and with self-interest plainly in mind.

Numerous persons told me that I just did not understand the Communists, that I had been deceived by Red-baiters.

Was I deceived? I notice that in the Daily Worker for June 12, 1956, a prominent American Communist, Howard Fast, now confesses that the Khrushchev revelations of Stalin's record constitute,

and I quote, "a record of barbarism and paranoid blood lust that will be a lasting and shameful memory to civilized man."

In 1944, immediately after Tehran, I questioned the nature of the political commitments made there. In a speech I made in the Senate on January 14, 1944, I said:

Americans want to know whether the national life and independence of any people in Europe—or Western Europe—whether in the Baltic region, the Balkans, or Western Europe have been endangered by American commitments or the failure to make strong American representations. Americans want to know how Poland, which was the only full ally which England and France had at the beginning of the war and which has been so horribly ravaged, is to be rewarded for its loyalty and supreme sacrifices.

That speech was made a full year before the Yalta conferences. I was given to understand that my suspicions were groundless. I was told that Mr. Roosevelt would handle matters, and that, anyway, I utterly misinterpreted Communist intentions.

Did I misinterpret their intentions? We know now how the Poles were rewarded. Their territory was carved up, their people were handed over to a reign of terror, and a gang of Polish stooges for Moscow were put in power.

Ten months before Yalta, I returned to this subject in a Senate speech on May 23, 1944. The speech was entitled "What Are Our Peace Aims?" I said:

Because the matter which I am presenting is so urgent, from this point on, I shall address myself directly to the President of the United States. President Roosevelt, the American people are not going to be content with a military victory only. We, as a people, are utterly in sympathy with your own sentiments which you expressed in a radio talk on May 27, 1941, wherein you said, "We will accept only a world consecrated to freedom of speech and expression—freedom of every person to worship God in their own way—freedom from want, and freedom from terrorism."

Well, how did we make out? Freedom to worship God? With Cardinal Mindszenty drugged, put through the third degree, flung into prison, let out again under the watch of the secret police, and now—as I understand it—in prison again? In Yugoslavia, Cardinal Stepinac under house guard and the constant surveillance of our friend Tito's goon squad. In Poland, the Archbishop of Warsaw shut up in a monastery and all but cut off from the outside world. As for China, you all have seen the photographs of those few missionaries who have been released. Although they went to China to spread the word of God, they have been shrunk to skin and bone, and are physical wrecks. These are the ways in which the Communists guarantee a person freedom to worship God in his own way.

Mr. President, let me point out that, despite those speeches which I made, I have heard Members of the Senate and other representatives of official Washington say, "Well, anyone can have hindsight." But, Mr. President, that was not hindsight; it was foresight. However, those in charge of our Government at that time closed their eyes and their ears to what was occurring. That was true not only of the executive branch

of the Government but also of some of the leading Members of the Congress of the United States at that time.

Yet again in the same speech of May 23, 1944, I said:

We know that [President Roosevelt] risking our whole future and the future of the postwar world on the good will of Mr. Stalin \* \* \* will never be accepted by the American people as their only safeguard against war and the threat of war.

And, I went on to say:

What are our peace aims, Mr. President, and do they bode good or ill? \* \* \* Are they a patchwork of unprecedented necessities which will merely postpone the final issue of war itself to the not-too-distant future? Why do you not take us, your own people, into your confidence, Mr. President? Is it because you wish to overwhelm us with joy when you suddenly pull a patchwork peace settlement out of your hat, or is it because the monster which you have helped to breed has broken its leash and is now at large?

Well, what happened? A year later, the Russians entered the Far Eastern war, just a few days before the Japanese surrender—just a few days, but with time enough to seize control of Manchuria and get their hands on North Korea, from which, in 1950, the Communists launched another bloody war.

We remember what happened. General MacArthur was forbidden victory; he was flung to the appeasers; and today, in North Korea, the arms buildup for a new Communist war goes on.

Now, we have the new look in Russia. Many of the intellectuals in this country are saying, "It is a new look." What is the reason for it? We can only speculate.

My own guess is that the reason is double. The first part of the reason is that their domestic political situation forced a new piece of window dressing. The rest of the reason is that those in charge of the Communist machine, never giving up for an instant, their goal of world dominion, now believe that an exhibition of sweetness and light will soften up the West.

The present Communist rulers cannot wash the blood from their own hands. Their helpless subjects have as yet no alternative but to pretend to accept the alibis.

But there is no such compulsion upon the free world, Mr. President. Why then, do we go along with the idea that Stalin's heirs are any different from their late boss? It should be obvious that only the most ruthless and corrupt of Stalin's subordinates, only those capable of doing his bloody work without wincing, could have survived a quarter of a century of purges under his suspicious eye. The very fact that they were at the time of Stalin's death—or was it murder?—his most intimate collaborators is proof enough that they are made of the same moral stuff. Whatever the interpretation for this sudden repudiation of Stalin, it could only stem from weakness.

Why not take advantage of this weakness in our opponents? Certainly this is not the time to dignify the culprits of the Kremlin by accepting them and extending the courtesies of normal statesmen. In doing this, we are only building them up with their own people at

this time when they are weakest. Such action can only confound and confuse our friends and give aid and comfort to our enemies. The terrorism to which those men admit having been a party should earn them the deserved disgust of the entire world.

We cannot be optimistic about our dealings with men to whom Stalin could be a deity for 25 years, and overnight become a demon. We will not grasp to our bosom those men, who for 25 years as Stalin's lieutenants were responsible for the torture of millions of Russians and the condemning of hundreds of thousands of victims to death by starvation and the atrocities committed in far-off Siberian prisons.

I appreciate that there will be those who will ask that I be more diplomatic and temperate in my language. I shall answer that moderation and diplomacy are perhaps requirements of foreign-affairs officers; but it is good to clear the air.

If ever there was a moment when the revulsion of mankind should have found forthright expression, it is now. The most extreme of the charges against the Soviet regime, those which our muddled pro-Sovieteers once denounced as inventions and slanders, have now been confirmed by the culprits themselves.

But we see no such revulsion. It is as if free men had lost their capacity for telling good and evil apart, their capacity for indignation at the spectacle of millionfold crimes, even the crimes of which they themselves were the victims.

I am forced to conclude that many times in the past, in the conduct of our foreign relations, we have lost the compass of moral principle. More and more we operate in gray areas, somewhere between good and evil. The excuse, of course, is "political realism." But history is our guaranty that such realism is a snare and a delusion.

It was a false expediency which produced Munich and Yalta and the chain of appeasements on which our Soviet enemy has been nourished to his present dimensions.

What have we got in exchange for the billion dollars we gave to Tito? We fed him, and bolstered him when Stalin tried to crush him; we supplied and equipped his army. And what do we get for our pains?

We get a Tito honeymoon staged in Moscow. We get a statement from Marshal Zhukov to Tito that in war the Kremlin and Tito will fight "shoulder to shoulder." We get an official statement that Tito and the Kremlin "will make stubborn efforts" to see that Red China is admitted to the United Nations. Are we supposed to forget that the United Nations voted Red China an aggressor in the Korean War, and that the ban has never been revoked?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Cotton in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I wish to say that I am filled with the same amazement

which seems to affect the Senator from New Hampshire at the proposal to include Tito in our mutual assistance. I raise the question—and I raise it with all the members of the Foreign Relations Committee—whether, by the millions of dollars we have spent—so much of it spent usefully and successfully—we have ever succeeded in actually buying anyone? I wish to suggest that the undertaking to buy Tito is a fruitless undertaking. We can rent him for a period of time, but the rent will be raised every month. I am ashamed to have my country enter into an auction with Soviet Russia for the good intentions of Tito, and I am going to find some way to vote against such a thing before our consideration of the pending bill has concluded.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Vermont. His idea about rental is a good one. I had not heard that expression used before about this matter.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Vermont to page 15 of the committee report on the bill, where the following statement appears:

#### 7. ASSISTANCE TO YUGOSLAVIA (SEC. 5)

Section 5 of the bill provides that, effective 90 days after its enactment, no assistance shall be furnished to Yugoslavia unless the President finds—

"(1) that there has been no change in the Yugoslavian policies on the basis of which assistance under this act has been furnished to Yugoslavia in the past, and that Yugoslavia is independent of control by the Soviet Union, and (2) that it is in the interest of the national security of the United States to continue the furnishing of assistance to Yugoslavia."

The committee views this section primarily as a statement of congressional concern over the state of our relations with Yugoslavia and particularly the state of Yugoslav relations with the Soviet Union.

For the record, I wish to make it clear that such aid will be cut off within 90 days, unless the President finds such aid to be "in the interest of the national security of the United States."

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to give a little advice to the President on my own. My way of doing so is by protesting against any further monetary support of Tito.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that I find myself in practically full accord with the bill, except on that one point, and that I have found so much difficulty in swallowing that portion of the bill that I have decided not to swallow it.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. If the system under which we have been operating since the end of World War II, whereby \$60 billion have been spent by this country on foreign economic and military aid, had proved effective in buying good will

and guaranteeing the cooperation and support of the recipient nations, then would it not be in order to contend that, under that kind of system, that kind of strategy, this country could command the support and cooperation of Tito? Conversely, the fact that we have not gained his friendship, support, and good will, notwithstanding the fact that we have given him many millions of dollars, justifies us in concluding that the system has failed, and that it is not possible to bribe leaders like Tito into supporting the free nations of the world by the use of millions of dollars?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is a fair assumption, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Idaho. If anyone can show me why we should provide more money to Tito, I should like to be shown. There may be Senators who can show me. There may be those in the State Department who can show me; but I have yet to meet them.

We get an official statement that East and West Germany must be reunited, not by plebiscite and popular vote, but by a negotiated deal. We get an official statement that Formosa must be handed over to Red China. Americans paid \$1 billion for this.

If any one can show me why we should provide more money to Tito, I should like to be shown. It was a disdain for moral values which maneuvered us into the folly for building up the dictator Tito of Yugoslavia. And it is the same retreat from moral standards which today creates the confusion over so-called neutralists.

"Neutrality," as I have said, made sense and still does where the opposing powers were primarily involved in a contest for territories, dynasties, frontiers, colonies, and economic advantages. We know—the whole world knows—that this is not the nature of the conquest at the present time. There is no quarrel between America and Russia on any such traditional grounds. If those were the issues, we would have no trouble coming to terms with the vast Soviet empire, just as we did with the British and other expanding empires in the past.

No. What divides us from the Communists are human, moral, and spiritual questions; the determination of a crusading totalitarianism to extend its pattern of life to the rest of the human race. Everytime a spokesman for the free world speaks of "neutrality" in the old sense in relation to our present dilemma, he cheapens the issue and betrays the high purpose of the free world. He helps make it seem—as the Kremlin wants it to seem—simply an old style duel for power. On that false assumption, the contest loses its true significance, and other countries are fortified in their delusion that the whole thing concerns only the main antagonists, namely, the United States and Soviet Russia.

It is at this point that I lose patience with those nations which are not only neutralist in their military position, but insist on neutralism in their moral position. I know of no worse offender in this regard than Nehru, who proclaims himself the moralist of Asia.

I know of no instance of Nehru having openly and sincerely taken the side of

freedom and democracy. I know only weasel words and idle pretensions. Nehru has yet to denounce slave-labor, torture, trial without jury, political violence, and all the absolute ruthless dictatorship that goes with Soviet Russia. It is just possible that Nehru may yet come around and denounce Stalin. Everyone else is doing it. It is thoroughly fashionable and quite safe to do it today. Dead men cannot retaliate.

On a more specific level, I cannot feel justified in voting large sums of foreign aid to India. In my view, foreign aid, military, economic and technical, is an instrument of foreign policy. Our foreign aid should be employed to build and nurture those allies and alliances necessary to protect us and to assure our safety. We must match with bonds of friendship the enmities our opponents try to create. We want to help other nations to strengthen them spiritually and economically, so that if they are assaulted or if we are assaulted, we will all be much stronger to resist and to fight. I do not care about buying gratitude but we ought to be buying something. Surely we are not spending \$5 billion a year on a huge giveaway charity program. We have no right to tax our people just to give largesse all over the world. If nations tell us they want our economic help but that what side they are on is none of our business, or that they see some good in both sides, and some bad in both sides—then how does helping them aid our foreign policy?

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. It has been a very great pleasure to the junior Senator from Idaho to listen to the profound remarks of the distinguished leader of the Republican minority policy committee. I know that the great statesman from the cradle of liberty, the State of New Hampshire, has devoted many months of thought to the speech he has just delivered. It is a speech which all America should read and heed.

In case any Member of this body thinks the foreign-aid program is generally popular, let him go among the people we are obliged to represent. Let him talk to the people who pay the taxes; let him talk to those who wonder what we are doing here. Let me say to my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New Hampshire who has served nearly two decades in this body, that we are representing the American people. We must do so or we should not be here. We have a different duty from that of the executive branch of the Government, especially the State Department. If we authorize the giving away of money it is no one's responsibility but ours. I heartily join in the remarks just made by my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire, when he says that he does not intend to vote to give the money of the American taxpayers to Mr. Nehru, who sat out the Korean war. Was not that notice enough to us in America? He has done nothing during the 6 years I have been a Member of the United States Sen-

ate. Tito is considered by some to be beyond reproach. Because of his recent honeymoon with the Communists I would not give him 10 cents if he were the last thing under the canopy of heaven. How can we justify giving a cent to Tito? He has said he would never be separated from his mother land the Communists, and the Communists have said in the event of war they would be on the side of Tito.

Going to another matter. What did we receive in return for what we gave to Nasser the strong man and leader of Egypt? We saw him embrace the Communists—another went down the drain to the Communists and our American taxpayer justly asks why? If we have been so successful in the field of giveaway and foreign aid, I cannot see many friends we have made as a result of that program. In fact, as a member of the Armed Services Committee of the United States Senate, I am afraid Tito, Nehru, and Nasser have set an example that may spread to others who profess to be our friends. Is not it a fact that our principal and fighting friends are people to whom we have given less money than to any others. I doubt if this can be denied.

In my estimation, the program has been generally an utter failure during the 6 years I have been in the United States Senate. The American taxpayer can no longer carry this burden without more assurance than lip service.

I make this statement as one who does not care whether anyone at the State Department likes these remarks or not. I am speaking as a representative of my sovereign State of Idaho. I shall have to be convinced before I will vote to give money to anyone who is not a dedicated, fighting ally of the United States. Whenever there is a doubt, I shall resolve the doubt in favor of my country.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that is a sound conclusion.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I do not want the Senator from New Hampshire to feel that I follow him too closely in anything except with respect to our friend from Yugoslavia. If any Senators wish to remain in the Chamber long enough after the Senator from New Hampshire has concluded, when I can obtain recognition Senators will hear another of my 15-minute speeches, dealing with the case for India.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad the Senator from Vermont agrees with me on the Tito-Yugoslavia situation. I am sure his position is sound on that point, but I am not so sure that I speak for his views on the second point. Of course, there is always room for an honest difference of opinion.

Mr. WELKER. Does the Senator from Vermont intend to give 15 minutes to Nasser?

Mr. FLANDERS. No; I am not prepared to do that. I give him less than that.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Reference has been made to India and to Nehru, particularly to Nehru as an advocate of neutralism. I have been rather reluctant in the past to be critical of Nehru, on the basis that he was probably trying patiently to work out some of the difficult problems confronting his great country.

A few days ago a former Member of the Senate, who is now the Ambassador to India, testified before the Committee on Appropriations. During the testimony, colloquy developed with regard to the serious situation which confronts us today, in which the Soviet nations, particularly Russia, and the United States are competing for the good will and support of Nehru and India. The Ambassador said we had probably contributed a half billion dollars to help India. I presume that all of it was for economic aid, because I am sure that Nehru would not accept military aid from this country. I asked the Ambassador how much the Soviet nations had given India during that same period of time that we had given India a half-billion dollars. The Ambassador's answer was, "Nothing."

Therefore, after the United States has given India a half billion dollars in economic aid and the Soviet countries have given India nothing, according to the Ambassador, we are confronted with the serious situation that, although the United States, as the leader of the free nations, is attempting to help India to resist Communist aggression throughout southeastern Asia, the United States is not in the favorable position there that the Soviet countries enjoy, notwithstanding the fact that Russia has not given India so much as 1 ruble in aid.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am very much interested in that point. I was not at the hearing when that particular colloquy took place. That is a very interesting point.

Mr. President, what kind of global do-gooding is this? How can we respect ourselves for giving our money and substance all over the world and asking nothing in return? What has this to do with an effective policy which in this day and age ought to be pretty hard, and realistic? Our survival as a people and as a Nation may depend on who our allies are and how firmly they stand with us. And if we do not have any allies, we ought to know that too, and act accordingly. This confusion—this soft-headedness—must end. We must realistically reappraise the whole business or in the end we will waste our substance and perish.

In leaving this question of sharing our financial and material resources with other nations, I should like to make one thing very clear. I have long favored the basis for our foreign aid program. I was for foreign aid nearly two decades ago, at a time when that position was not entirely popular, because I believed that it was essential to the security of the United States and the protection of the free world. I am still for a truly mutual assistance program, with particular emphasis on aiding those countries who honestly intend to help themselves and the rest of the free world.

We do not lose sight of the fact that some countries and peoples are more exposed and more vulnerable to Soviet pressures than others. The temptation to forget moral values in their desire to live and stave off attack is understandably stronger upon them. But where are they to find a source of strength to resist if not in our America? We should be supplying the courage, the moral fiber, and the religious conviction to resist. Where are they to find a guarantee that all is not lost if America, too, begins to go neutralist, even if it evades the unpleasant word?

Let us bear in mind that every American compromise, however it may be explained, is multiplied in other countries into surrenders. Our job, to insure our own security and to secure the survival of freedom on this earth, is to galvanize the stragglers, the fearful, the intimidated, by examples of moral valor and spiritual dedication. Such is the rule of leadership which, though we never sought it, we can reject only to our own peril.

That is what I meant when I said that attitudes and basic principles are no less decisive than actions and policies. An attitude of compromise on essentials, phony friendships with gangsters at any price, leads to one set of decisions. An attitude related to deep-rooted moral values leads to an opposite set of decisions.

It is precisely these underlying considerations which must be examined in the debate on foreign policy which will develop in the forthcoming election campaign. We can excuse and make up for failures of particular policies. Those reflect the mistakes of fallible men in a complex situation.

We dare not excuse a failure of nerve and a failure of principle, for those witness a weakening and threaten a collapse of our whole moral structure. If the present drift to cynical grayness, where once we knew the difference between black and white, is not arrested and reversed, we shall lose our ability to defend ourselves. Indeed, we shall have little left that is worth defending.

Mr. President, in making these remarks I have tried to make my views clear. I wish to point out, however, to the people of the United States, particularly to Members of the Senate, that my position has been clear and consistent over the years. I have stood here through the years—and the official records of the United States Senate will bear me out—and my position has never varied. Sometimes I have stood here almost alone.

I have taken abuse. I can remember submitting a resolution to prohibit the shipment of scrap iron and steel and aviation gasoline to Japan. I can remember the abuse I took for doing that. I was right, Mr. President.

I can remember voting for the extension of the Selective Service Act in the summer before Pearl Harbor. I walked out the door, and there was met by a group of women who were dressed in black, wearing black hats and black veils. They carried a sign reading "Mothers of America." Now, these were phony mothers. They were there, and

they tried to spit on some Senators who dared to vote for the extension of the Selective Service Act.

That is how it has been in the past. We see the same thing today. We see people closing their eyes and burying their heads in the sand with respect to what is going on in the world.

As a believer in helping those who will help themselves and who stand on moral principles, I sincerely hope that we will be realistic in our approach to this problem.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Idaho can recall when the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire stood on the floor of the Senate and opposed the dismantling of the industrial plants in Germany, when efforts were being made by leaders of the Roosevelt administration to destroy the industrial and economic power of Germany, so that it would remain only an agrarian nation.

Mr. BRIDGES. I can remember that very well. The Senator from Idaho and the Senator from New Hampshire stood here together and protested. In spite of that, we were overridden. The dismantling program went on, and the plants went to countries which are now using them against us.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the Senator from New Hampshire realize that in the interim this country has expended approximately \$4 billion for economic aid to rehabilitate the German people and to build up the industrial potential of West Germany? Much of that money undoubtedly was expended in an effort to repair the damage which was done when this country participated in that tragic agreement to destroy the industrial power of Germany.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. We proceeded with the Morgenthau plan under which we allowed the dismantling of factory after factory, and the equipment was sent to Communist countries. Then the American taxpayers dug down to help carry on the rehabilitation program.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Eight years ago the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire was serving as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations when the first appropriation bill to implement the Marshall plan was passed. I was a member of the Appropriations Committee at that time, and I well recall the courageous position taken by the Senator from New Hampshire. While he was not opposed to the entire program of foreign aid at that time, he took the position that we could accomplish very little in our efforts to buy good will by bribing nations instead of encouraging them to display self-reliance and independence in order to attain a basis of equality in defending the free nations of the world.

The Senator from New Hampshire is deserving a commendation for the successive positions he has taken when he displayed such courage, intelligence, and good judgment at a time when some of the newspapers of this country and some of the leaders in both parties were taking untenable and indefensible positions

because it was popular at that time to take a calculated risk, and to roll out billions of American dollars in what has proved to be a fruitless and ineffectual effort to buy the good will of nations which have failed to cooperate fully with the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Idaho. I might point out to him that the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from New Hampshire were two of the very few Senators who opposed the Italian peace treaty. Let us mention just one provision of that treaty. It was to take what was left of the Italian nation, divide it up, and give it to some of the Communist countries. We have been spending money to build ships to give to Italy so as to build up the navy which we took away from her and gave to Russia and other countries. Some of the features of our foreign policy over the years, when we look at the record, are amazing, shocking, and inconsistent.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does not a summarization of many of these rather tragic experiences which have befallen the United States justify, probably, the agonizing reappraisal which was proposed not long ago by one of our officials, so that instead of expanding the foreign-aid program the time has arrived for us to be realistic in reexamining the program, and to determine whether it has been successful and whether we are justified in continuing to spend billions of dollars abroad?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, once again I commend the great Senator from New Hampshire for his profound speech. I wish to relate a certain conversation which I had with a prominent man in my State a few days ago. When the Tito incident occurred he said, in a jocular vein, "Well, Senator, you had better go back and appropriate twice as much money. We might buy him back."

I am firmly of the opinion that we cannot buy friendship. If one continually gives money to a needy person the minute the gift is discontinued, he will be criticized. Some of these recipients are not needy. Where is this thing going to end? I remember some of our leaders standing up and saying, "I am voting for the foreign-aid program for the last time." Yet today we hear them arguing for its continuance.

Has the situation improved with our allies? In my opinion, the situation has become worse.

Has the Senator given any thought to what happened in Iceland? We gave Iceland more than \$34 million, outright, plus giant radar installations, plus the airbases there, which cost nearly \$200 million dollars, bringing to them an economy which any country on the face of the earth would love to have. What has happened within the past few hours with respect to Iceland? Are we getting stronger, or are we getting weaker? The Communists have us in dire straits. We are about to get kicked out of the country we have helped so much.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that is a sample of the fear I have as to whether the countries which are members of NATO will stand up in a crisis when a great danger confronts us. If they weaken now, in peaceful, normal times, what will happen then? We have invested approximately \$160 million in a great air base in Iceland. Having done that in good faith, under an agreement signed with that country, what are we going to do now? Are we just going to leave? I do not know what the policy will be, but I know it is a very uncertain thing.

Mr. WELKER. Can we assume for a moment that if any conflict occurred between the Communists and the United States Iceland would help us, in view of the elections of day before yesterday? Of course not; it is ridiculous even to think they will help us.

Mr. BRIDGES. I would have a great deal of doubt as to that.

Mr. WELKER. Why do not the Members of this body recall the words of the man who said he would let the nations spend themselves into bankruptcy, would bleed them white from within, and cause them to fall into his hands like overripe fruit, and take them without a shot.

I hope the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire will not assume, as I know he will not, that I know anything about foreign relations, but I do know something about commonsense. If the Senator and I do not use commonsense in representing our people, we are derelict in our duty.

Mr. President, I certainly commend the Senator from New Hampshire for the very enlightening and able speech he has made. I watched the Senator many years before I became a Member of the Senate. He is the oldest in service of any Republican Senator, but is still a young man. It will be the highlight of my life that I have known a statesman of his character and his ability.

Mr. BRIDGES. I appreciate the distinguished Senator's remarks. I hope for many years to come the Senator from Idaho will be a Member of the Senate, where he is serving his country and his State so conscientiously, so courageously, so ably and well.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield for a moment?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas withhold his suggestion for a moment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maine will be good enough to yield to me before a quorum is called, I wish to submit four amendments to the bill to be printed overnight, and I desire to make a brief explanation of the four amendments. I am sure it will not take more than 5 minutes, unless I am interrupted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The quorum call will not take that long.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well. I withdraw my request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR ELLENDER AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning business tomorrow, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] may be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself, I submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

*Ordered*, That, effective on Thursday, June 28, 1956, after the hour of 3 p. m., during the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11356, the Mutual Security Act of 1956, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received, with the exception of the Johnston (South Carolina)-Payne amendment relating to textiles and the Young amendment relating to agricultural commodities.

*Ordered further*, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal (June 27, 1956).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to address a question to the distinguished majority leader. Does the Senator from Texas have any idea that any other Senator wants to debate the bill, or is this to be a sort of "closed corporation" action?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; every Senator can speak on the bill, and, I assume, can offer amendments.

Mr. WELKER. I have no amendments to offer. I simply want to vote against everybody who is not a friend of the United States of America.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Idaho will have ample opportunity to speak.

Mr. WELKER. I am wondering how there will be enough time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator will have ample opportunity to speak.

Mr. WELKER. How much time will be allowed on the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Idaho may have as much time as he wishes within the 2 hours on the bill.

I have worked out the agreement with the distinguished minority leader, with the distinguished chairman of the minority policy committee, with the chairman of the committee, and with as many other Senators as I understood intended to offer amendments. I was not aware of the interest of the Senator from Idaho in any particular amendment, but I shall be glad to offer an amendment to the proposed agreement, or the Senator himself can offer one, to enable him to have time in which to speak. There is no disposition to prevent any Senator from discussing the bill.

Mr. WELKER. I do not want to act under a subterfuge by offering a number of amendments merely for the purpose of using a little time. I want to debate the bill fully.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator will have ample opportunity to do so.

Mr. WELKER. I merely wanted to know. I realize that the majority leader has discussed the matter with the leaders on both sides of the aisle. I know there will be a great amount of argument on both sides, but there is nothing more important to me than that there be full debate on the matter.

Mr. FLANDERS. I might suggest to the distinguished majority leader that if there is some doubt as to there being sufficient time, the Senate might convene earlier tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There are committee meetings which would prevent that, but I should be glad, if the Senator from Idaho would like to have me do so, to provide additional time on the bill. On many occasions time is yielded back on bills. I feel certain the Senator can secure time in which to speak. If he cannot get it on his side of the aisle, he can get it on this side of the aisle.

Mr. WELKER. I do not wish to be argumentative.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No. The Senator is entitled to time.

Mr. President, I modify the unanimous-consent agreement so as to provide 3 hours on the bill.

Mr. WELKER. I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement, as modified? The Chair hears none, and the agreement, as modified, is entered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me for 5 minutes?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Maine is very gracious.

Mr. President, I ask the Chair to call me to order if I exceed 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I submit four amendments to the bill and ask that they be printed overnight, so that they will be ready in time for the debate on the bill tomorrow. The four amendments deal with what I conceive to be very important phases of the measure.

The bill contains a statement of policy. In that statement of policy I should like to write a declaration that it is the policy of the Congress of the United States to maintain and expand its airpower through the construction, in accordance with appropriations heretofore or hereafter made by the Congress, of planes, guided missiles, and other advanced weapons, so long as Soviet Russia expands its power. I do not want American airpower to lag behind that of the Soviet Empire.

The second amendment deals with the same subject matter. It adds a new section 13 and reads:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, in the event any portion of the funds appropriated by the Congress in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1957, for aircraft and related procurement is impounded by Executive order or otherwise and not expended, there shall be withheld from expenditure a corresponding percentage of the unexpended balances of funds appropriated pursuant to authorizations contained in this act.

The other two amendments deal with the very important question of the authority of the officers and employees of the executive branch to withhold information from Congress. When Congress passes laws under which the Executive acts, and when Congress provides the money under which the executive department carries on its functions, Congress is entitled, in my judgment, to have complete information with respect to what is done.

The bill contains appropriations of billions of dollars to be expended by the President. It is impossible for him solely to spend them; it is impossible for him solely to make the arrangements which will be necessary for their expenditure.

So the third amendment to section 521 of the bill requires the President to transmit quarterly to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs a list of the names of all persons to whom delegations of authority have been made under this section, together with a statement of the experience, business affiliations, and employment status of each such person.

The fourth and final amendment I think I shall read, because it deals with this very important question. On page 46, between lines 5 and 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

Sec. 538. Furnishing of information to congressional committees: Upon the request of any appropriate committee of the Senate or House of Representatives, any joint committee of the two Houses, or any subcommittee of any such committee, any officer or employee of the Government having information, or having custody of documents or other data, relating to the programs being administered under this act, shall promptly furnish any such information, documents, or other data to such committee or subcommittee.

Mr. President, I propose to offer these amendments when the proper time comes, because I do not believe that the executive authority should lower any iron curtain to bar the Congress of the United States from obtaining information regarding activities which can be carried on only by the authority of the Congress.

I thank the gracious Senator from Maine for yielding to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments proposed to be offered by the Senator from Wyoming will be received, and printed, and will lie on the table.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maine will yield very briefly, I should like to make an announcement. I do not know how many amendments will be offered tomorrow. It is planned to begin the session at 12 o'clock noon.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to have the Senate continue in session rather late tomorrow evening, as late as 9 or 10 o'clock, if it appears to be at all possible to complete action on the bill. If not, the Senate will meet on Friday, continue in session late on Friday, and conclude action on the bill. So I should like to give notice of an evening session, if that is agreeable.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I fully concur. I am glad the majority leader is giving notice now, so Senators may be advised and may make their arrangements accordingly. If action on the bill cannot be concluded tomorrow, I think it would be well to have the Senate sit later than it normally does so as to conclude action on the bill on Friday.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Heretofore when we have had sessions in the evening, there is one thing I have heard practically every Senator and everybody else who works in the Senate complain about, and that is the dining room. When we are going to be in session in the evening—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire we do not have to be in session in order to hear complaints about the dining room.

Mr. BRIDGES. When we are to be in session in the evening those who operate the dining room should take due notice, and they should have food and an appropriate number of waiters available, and should be prepared to give service. It is disgusting, when we have night sessions, to find that we cannot have good food and service available in the dining room.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like first to comment on the remarks made by the Senator from New Hampshire, and then I should like to hear from the Senator from Maine. I want the RECORD to show that we are not only

warning the Senate that we are going to have a night session, but we are warning the dining room and the managers of the dining room, and we are going to expect to eat, and we are going to expect them to have the help and the food in order to provide us with a good meal tomorrow evening.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. The Senator from Maine should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire if he would not be willing to join the Senator from Maine in her efforts for the past 3 years in an attempt to get decent and clean food at reasonable prices.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Maine that should be one of our objectives, and he commends the Senator from Maine, who has conscientiously and consistently tried to bring that about.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. But the Senator from Maine gets very little assistance. In fact, within the past 10 days, another effort was made, and we are still waiting for clean and good food at prices that at least the members of the staff can afford to pay.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope Senators will take judicial notice of the statement made by the chairman of the minority policy committee and the Senator from Maine, as well as the majority leader, to see that the restaurant is put on due notice that we expect to be visiting with them tomorrow evening. We expect to have clean and good food, in abundant quantity.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Will the majority leader join in asking that that objective be carried out through the year in the cafeterias as well as the Senate dining room?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I cannot speak for the minority leader, but the majority leader is always persuaded by his friend from Maine, and he will be glad to go into the question with her. If she will state what contribution he can make to the general cause, he will be glad to make it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Whether the question was directed to the majority leader or the minority leader, I shall be glad to join in that effort.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. This is the greatest cooperation I have been able to obtain in the restaurant matter. It is only a matter which requires the Committee on Rules and Administration to move.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will say to the Senator from Maine that this cooperation is typical of the kind we get every day, but maybe it is more enjoyable because of the generous contribution which the distinguished lady has made today.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, for many years now I have gone along with and supported the foreign-aid program. It is my sincere belief that this program has produced results of benefit to our country and to the world, in that it has done much to provide the armed peace that we now have—and in stopping and reversing the spread of communism in Europe. It

certainly checked and stopped communism from taking over France and Italy and Western Europe. It certainly prevented the loss of Turkey and Greece to the Communists.

But there have been flaws in that program, however unseen they might be. For example, one of the great flaws has been our aid to Yugoslavia—and more pointedly put, Communist Yugoslavia.

We have gambled on Yugoslavia—I am told to at least the tune of \$1 billion—and we have lost. For Tito has now resumed his ties and affection with Communist Russia.

I do not say that we should not have gambled. I acknowledge that it was worth a try as long as there was some chance that Yugoslavia would make her break with Communist Russia permanent. It was worth the gamble—although I doubt in the amount we have paid—not only from the hope of severing Yugoslavia from Communist Russia, but of having such an example encourage other satellites of Communist Russia to have the courage and strength to assert their independence from Communist Russia.

I do not say that we have lost completely on the gamble we made. I acknowledge that for a few years our aid to Tito and Yugoslavia did weaken the position of Russia in Eastern Europe—or at least prevented it from getting stronger. But what we may overlook in making this acknowledgment is that the real gain was made by Tito instead of the United States.

Let us face the facts realistically: We have poured out a billion dollars to a shrewd international blackmailer who was playing both sides against the middle, Russia and the United States against each other. And talking about examples encouraging other nations to follow suit, surely we should wake up to the fact that there is a greater danger that Tito is an example of encouragement to other countries to do the same thing—to get huge sums of aid from the United States by threatening to go to the side of Russia—than the wishful hope of an example encouraging other countries to come to our side.

For if Tito can play Russia and the United States off against each other to the tune of a billion dollars worth of aid from the United States—and then at the very first wooing call of Communist Russia to come back into the anti-American Communist world to nearly break his neck going back to the side of Russia—then why will other countries not be encouraged to make a sucker out of the United States, just as Tito has done?

But the cry is made that Tito has said that while he has publicly proclaimed that Russia and Yugoslavia will stand together in case of war, he has quickly assured the United States and the Western world that he does not want to break ties with them. What kind of double talk is this? How long are we going to swallow it?

To those who propose that we set Tito and Yugoslavia up as an example to other countries to encourage them to break with Communist Russia, I say, "Yes. Let's make him an example, but not the way you want. Let's make him

an example to the rest of the world that we are tired of his duplicity and blackmail and that we refuse to be made suckers any longer!"

Let us make an example of Tito to the rest of the world by showing that we want no part of his ways. It should be completely clear now that we could never depend upon him.

Some persons attempt to explain and excuse Tito by saying that he is acting independently. But what difference does it make if he acts independently, when he independently enters into a military alliance with Communist Russia—when he independently sides with Communist Russia? What kind of independence is that? Communist independence? Certainly not anti-Communist independence—and even hardly independence from Communist Russia!

Chapter 4, section 143, of the mutual security authorization bill provides that no assistance shall be furnished to Yugoslavia unless it is found that, first, there has been no change in Yugoslav policies on which assistance has been furnished in the past; second, that Yugoslavia is independent of control by the Soviet Union; and third, that it is in the interest of the national security of the United States to continue furnishing assistance to Yugoslavia.

Let us consider these point by point. The only way that it can be concluded that there has been no change in Yugoslav policies is to conclude that all along Yugoslavia and Tito have really kept their sympathies with Communist Russia. That is hardly a basis for continuing aid to Tito.

Otherwise, how can we overlook the recent triumphal return of Tito to Communist Russia, and his statement that Yugoslavia and Communist Russia will stand side by side? If that is not a sufficient change from what some have contended was an independent Tito attitude, to stop assistance to Tito, then I do not know what is.

As for whether Yugoslavia is independent of control by the Soviet Union, I say that is not necessarily the test. I say so because I predict that before too long the world may see Tito emerge as the chief international spokesman for the Communist world—perhaps even more powerful than the Russian leaders themselves. In that case it is idle to talk about independence of control by the Soviet Union.

As for whether it is in the interest of the national security of the United States to continue furnishing assistance to Yugoslavia and Tito, I ask these questions: Is it in the interest of American security to continue to pay blackmail to Tito? Is it in the interest of American security to show to other nations of the world that Tito's blackmail and ultimate siding with Communist Russia are the effective way to squeeze the most out of the United States? I think the answers are clear.

Now let us look at the statement of policy in the bill—that world peace and the security of the United States are in danger as long as international communism and the nations it controls continue by military threats, economic pressure, and internal subversion, to attempt to

dominate peoples now free and independent, and continue to oppress peoples and nations once free, but now subject to Communist domination.

What a mockery continued aid to Tito, that leader of international communism—and perhaps in the not-too-distant future the foremost leader of international communism—is to the statement of policy of this bill. What a mockery does continued aid to Tito make of the phrase "military threats" in the statement of policy, when Tito has just recently proclaimed that Yugoslavia will fight alongside Communist Russia in the event of war. What a mockery is the reference to "economic pressure," when that is exactly what Tito is doing to us with his blackmail. What a mockery when Tito himself has enslaved to Communist domination the once free people of Yugoslavia, and has recently reaffirmed his adherence and allegiance to that Communist enslavement.

Mr. President, in all good conscience to the people of my country—in all good conscience to my country—I cannot go along with continued payment of blackmail to Tito, and especially in the face of the clear manner in which he has recently wedded himself and Yugoslavia to Communist Russia and to her causes, aims, and objectives.

In a struggle for personal power, Tito broke with Stalin and Molotov over personal greed—but not over Communist principles. Now that Khrushchev and Bulganin have snuggled up to him and pampered his vanity, he visions himself as the future senior partner in the Communist ruling clique, jubilantly returns to the fold, not having for a second forsaken Communist principles.

Tito is no neutralist. Tito is a Communist, tied lock, stock, and barrel to the Kremlin, despite all his two-faced talk about independence. And the sooner we recognize it the sooner we keep the faith with the American people.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to pay my tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Maine for her very courageous and clear-cut statement outlining her belief in regard to what our policy toward Tito and Yugoslavia should be. She has spoken words of wisdom which all the American people should heed.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. I wish to state that he, himself, has led the way in the matter of the proper position for us to take regarding aid to Yugoslavia.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Maine yield to me?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, in line with the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], I wish to say that I appreciate very much, indeed, the excellent statement which has just been made by our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. Once again she is right, and once again she has spoken words which the American people can clearly

understand. I know she has again been of very great aid to America.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho is always cooperative and helpful in working on matters in which both he and I are interested, especially in connection with the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I seek the floor; but before doing so, I wish to express my great admiration for the position taken by the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and for the way in which she has stated it.

Let me say to her that I believe the way in which she was presented the matter this evening to the Senate will be a tower of strength in connection with what we are endeavoring to do in regard to this matter. I am very glad, indeed, to have had the privilege of hearing the distinguished senior Senator from Maine speak.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont. As always, he is most generous and helpful in connection with all matters with which we are concerned.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President—

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] on her remarks. I agree with her remarks and her conclusions, and I appreciate very much the statement she has made to the Senate today.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Texas gives me great courage to go on.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President—

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I yield to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say that I have been very much impressed by the statement which has been made by the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. I must say that as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I have not been impressed fully, at any rate, by the arguments of the State Department in regard to this issue. I think it constitutes a very grave problem which we are facing in the field of foreign policy. Although, as in the case of many public issues, undoubtedly there are two sides to it, I think it most important that the distinguished senior Senator from Maine has presented the issue so forthrightly to the Senate.

Mr. President, I believe there is much danger that continued aid on our part to Yugoslavia may, in turn, encourage Communists in Italy or in France to say, "Well, look at Yugoslavia. She has a Marxian-Communist system, and is following a policy parallel to that of the men in the Kremlin. But Yugoslavia is receiving aid from the United States. Therefore, what reason is there for us to vote anti-Communist? Obviously, we can continue to receive both economic aid and military aid from the United States, regardless of how we vote."

Mr. President, if the Kremlin is attempting further to deceive the West—as I believe those in the Kremlin are attempting to do—then I believe that

situation might encourage other satellite States—Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia—while still maintaining Communist governments, to say, "Let us show just a little independence, as Tito has done, and in that case we can apply successfully for both arms aid and economic aid from the United States." And the same argument might be made, namely, that we should supply both arms aid and economic aid to those Communist countries.

Therefore, Mr. President, certainly the State Department has not fully answered those questions—at least, not to my satisfaction; and I think it very important that this issue be laid forthrightly before the American people.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I thank my distinguished colleague, the minority leader, for his very generous words. I have not had the privilege of serving with him on the Foreign Relations Committee, but I have had the privilege of sitting with him at the table during meetings of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee dealing with foreign aid and State Department appropriations. I have found him well-informed, and have been delighted to go along with him on many issues. We are in complete agreement on the attitude of the Kremlin. I hope that before we are through we may know more about the question of where foreign aid should go, and where it should not go.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think there is one additional danger. It, too, is subject to two interpretations. When we are dealing with the men in the Kremlin and with communism as a whole, all Americans must recognize as a fact that, as a part of their doctrine, it is fundamental with them that they can cheat, deceive, and lie, so long as they achieve their ultimate objective.

Some people have jumped to the conclusion that because during the past few days the Communist Parties in France, Italy, the United States, and Great Britain have been critical of Khrushchev and his downgrading of Stalin, they have thereby demonstrated a degree of independence in the Communist world. I submit that the situation might well be just the opposite. It may well be that a new party line has been sent out by the Kremlin to the Communist Parties in the United States, Great Britain, France, and Italy, to this effect: "As a part of our new foreign policy, show a little independence. We are going to encourage our other satellites to do so, in an attempt to deceive the western nations and cause them to let their guard down."

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. The Senator from California is so right. I thank him.

#### UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

##### IV. INDIA

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, we are committed to the defense of the free world against Communist imperialism and colonialism. In that defense the key to the whole continent of Asia is the great new independent India.

A visit to that country last December sharpened my understanding and my apprehension as to its future. However, any of us can follow the trend of events in the news and many will come to much the same conclusions that I did in the course of a brief 15-day visit.

That visit coincided with the last week of the tour of Bulganin and Khrushchev. I was present at the airfield when they took off for Afghanistan and home. I was able to observe at first hand the procedures by which these two Soviet officials were received, entertained, and speeded on their way.

As at all their appearances, and there were many, the population was invited by every available means of communication to be present at the places of meeting, speaking, and departing, and to become acquainted with the nation's guests. Literally millions of the Indian population saw the Russians and heard translations of their addresses. Incidentally, I have never heard a public address system as nearly technically perfect as was that at the airfield when they made their departure. Understanding neither Russian nor the Indian language, into which the address was translated, I could not know what was being said, but what was said was said distinctly, clearly, and impressively.

Thousands of people were brought to the airfield that morning in response to broadcast appeals and instructions made throughout the streets of Delhi. There was needed no exercise of government authority to bring them together. The people made a gala of the occasion, coming by all means of transportation—on foot, by bus, by car, by taxi, by horse-drawn vehicles, and even in bullock carts. Apparently, as on other similar occasions, people came in from the country and camped out overnight. It was a moving spectacle.

But to the Western visitor the spectacle was one that boded ill for the future of India. On almost every appearance one or the other of the visitors said something that was not true and was obviously barefaced propaganda. Mr. Nehru picked up these misstatements as fast as they were offered and replied to and corrected them in the press. The difficulty is that millions of people saw and heard the visitors and only hundreds of thousands had access to the rebuttal. The net result must have been to leave the impression in the minds of the Indian citizens that their visitors were honored guests and bearers of sweetness and light. Is this a permanent deposit in the minds of the Indian citizens? Will that deposit remain as an effective element in the future of India? Mr. Nehru is anti-Communist in accordance with his own lights, but neither you nor I nor he will live forever.

There may perhaps be some significance in the fact that the Communist Party in India, according to latest information, is now directed to support the Congress Party instead of opposing it.

There are, it seems to me, other dangerous influences leading toward new strength for communism in India. One of them is the series of 5-year plans of which the first was largely and wisely devoted to the increase of food produc-

tion. In spite of careful explanations and arguments to the contrary, I continue to fear that the second 5-year plan is directed toward an overindustrialization of India. The danger here lies in the fact that India has a surplus working population. Industrialization is directed toward efficiency in production and the reduction of labor costs. What India needs is not labor saving, but labor utilization. That great country must find, I am convinced, a purely Indian solution to its problem of food deficiency and labor surplus. The solutions which the Western World and the United States have found in industrialization will not apply in southern Asia. The pattern is not the economy of the United States or the forced industrialization of Russia or China. Following any of these lines will lead to unemployment, not employment. Increases in unemployment will make the country susceptible to Communist penetration and ultimate control. This fear seems unjustified to those who are planning for the future of India. But they seem reasonable to anyone familiar with Western industrial history who remembers that it took much more than a century before the common man of Great Britain received any benefit at all from the industrial revolution.

These are dangers to India in the present situation. Having an interest in the freedom of the world, which includes the Continent of Asia, we have to consider certain things. Is there anything we can do to help in this situation? The first thing for us to do is completely to revise our attitude towards India and its people. We have, most importantly, to reject any attempt to compel that country to accept and follow our world leadership. To offer large measures of assistance in return for accepting our hegemony will result in complete failure of our purposes.

Again, we must remember the principle stated earlier that we must know what other people are thinking about, what their ideals are, what their prejudices are, and in the light of this knowledge, must see to it that we do not needlessly stir them up.

The most useful thing we can do in behalf of our endeavor to strengthen freedom is to direct our main efforts toward help in the fundamental requirements of the citizens of India, which are food, clothing, shelter, health, and education.

In saying that, I am not suggesting that we feed them, clothe them, shelter them, and teach them. I am suggesting that we apply our resources of experience and technical ability to assisting them in a cooperative effort to undertake these things for themselves.

If we offer assistance in these fundamentals, we will be engaged in a field of assistance where the Russians are not prepared to compete with us. There are, in addition, general policies in our assistance to underdeveloped countries which apply in India as elsewhere. To those I will refer in a subsequent talk.

Above all there should be a wide extension of personal contacts between the Western people and particularly those of our own country and the people of

India. These personal contacts must be on the fundamental basis of the equality of human beings in the sight of God.

In making those contacts the Westerner meets many puzzling problems. One of them is what seems to us a limited view of the field of moral responsibilities. It seems to be no concern of the Indian that Communist imperialism is the greatest colonial empire-maker in the world today. So deeply engrained in the Indian consciousness is the problem of the color line that this new colonialism appears to him to be a matter of no concern so long as it is a tyranny of white people over white people. The dangers to people of all colors, races, creeds, and social institutions are not immediately apprehended since the color problem does not seem at the moment to be involved. The best contribution we can make to overcoming this curtain of misunderstanding between the East and the West is to revert to our own slow but continuous improvement in the relations between the white and colored people of our own country.

Mr. President, let it be said that India is politically our equal among the nations. It surpasses us in population. It is inferior to us in area and resources. But politically it is our equal. This we must recognize in word, in action, and in our inmost thoughts if we are to maintain such relations as will help to save Asia for freedom.

In the first of this series of talks our national interest was defined in these terms: It "lies in so directing our words and our acts that we may help to organize a world in which freedom, justice, and peace prevail, and which is the kind of a world we would bequeath to our children and grandchildren."

This is the national interest of India also. If we can speak and act with sufficient wisdom, we and they can work together in a common cause.

Mr. President, in closing, let me express my regret at the way in which the intended visit of Mr. Nehru with our President has been canceled. The date set for that visit was from the 7th to the 14th of July. It is understandable that the President's convalescence has made that date an inadvisable one. It is unfortunate that practically simultaneously it was announced that the President would fly to the Conference of Pan-American Presidents in Panama on the 21st. Taken alone this is an understandable decision. Inevitably, however, it will be compared in the eyes and minds of the world with the decision to postpone the visit with Mr. Nehru.

The Conference of Pan-American Presidents is exceedingly important. It cannot, however, rank in importance with the necessity for a face-to-face conversation between our President and Mr. Nehru on which the whole fate of a great continent might well depend. It is imperative, therefore, that negotiations for a later conference should be undertaken at once. That conference should not be deferred for months. Let the world have some indication, some assurance, that the significance of the opportunity is recognized by us.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there are no other Senators who desire to address the Senate at this time,

I shall move that the Senate stand adjourned until tomorrow, pursuant to the previous order entered.

First, I wish again to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that we may have a very late session tomorrow evening. I should like the RECORD to show that fact, so that all Senators should cancel other engagements, because we expect to have votes on the pending measure.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to repeat the statement which was made earlier today by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. Although there is quite a bit of classified material which could not be presented in the committee report on the pending bill—and I am sure Senators can well understand that fact—as the distinguished chairman of the committee has indicated, any Member of the Senate who desires to examine the confidential worksheets which the committee itself had before it in the consideration of the bill, may do so by contacting the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations in the committee room, which is located just below us in the Capitol. Any Senator who desires to examine the records may do so.

#### ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 27, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2512) to amend the act of August 27, 1954, so as to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died or were killed while serving in such forces.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, June 28, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 27, 1956:

##### POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

##### ARKANSAS

Smiley F. Buck, Altus, Ark., in place of C. C. Pitts, deceased.  
Herschel A. Webb, Beebe, Ark., in place of Sarah Abington, retired.  
William E. Place, Parkdale, Ark., in place of J. H. Nobles, retired.

##### CALIFORNIA

Willabelle F. Spafford, Midway City, Calif., in place of J. E. Mixer, resigned.  
John W. Harding, Ukiah, Calif., in place of R. J. Cunningham, resigned.

Harry A. Smith, Williams, Calif., in place of M. N. Harlan, retired.

##### COLORADO

Edward H. Hargraves, Creede, Colo., in place of P. A. Lemke, removed.  
Alvah L. Pearsall, Monte Vista, Colo., in place of J. D. Wilson, deceased.

##### CONNECTICUT

Joseph B. Raccone, Windsor Locks, Conn., in place of W. F. Rabbett, Jr., retired.

##### FLORIDA

Harry Beckner, Jr., Mango, Fla., in place of W. A. Lehmann, retired.  
John R. Higgins, Samoset, Fla., in place of W. D. Thomas, retired.

##### GEORGIA

Reita A. Williamson, Flintstone, Ga., in place of C. E. Rogers, resigned.  
Clara Jean S. Bentley, Palmetto, Ga., in place of E. B. Cotton, retired.

##### ILLINOIS

Raymond D. Manis, Ewing, Ill., in place of W. H. King, deceased.  
Stanley J. Fisher, Macomb Ill., in place of T. L. Roark, retired.

##### IOWA

Merle M. Funk, Monona, Iowa, in place of G. J. Carroll, removed.

##### KANSAS

Calvin C. Matteson, Manchester, Kans., in place of J. C. Swigart, retired.

##### KENTUCKY

Francis E. Ryan, Verona, Ky., in place of Mayro Hayden, resigned.

##### LOUISIANA

John W. Lewis, Jr., Alexandria, La., in place of J. L. Treadway, retired.

##### MAINE

Harold K. Joy, South Berwick, Maine, in place of J. P. Davis, deceased.

##### MASSACHUSETTS

Cecil B. Wheeler, Jr., Berlin, Mass., in place of R. E. Taylor, deceased.  
Walter Rinki, Lunenburg, Mass., in place of E. A. Brown, resigned.

##### MICHIGAN

Frederick M. Davenport, Constantine, Mich., in place of E. L. Wittenberg, transferred.  
Clark E. Nogle, Plainwell, Mich., in place of S. J. Doster, retired.

##### MINNESOTA

Maurice A. Walline, Starbuck, Minn., in place of D. R. Wollan, transferred.

##### MISSISSIPPI

Marvin L. Lindsey, Nettleton, Miss., in place of J. C. Young, transferred.

##### MISSOURI

Eugene H. Terry, Exeter, Mo., in place of E. L. Smithson, retired.  
DeRoy Frazee, Willow Springs, Mo., in place of J. W. Brown, Jr., resigned.

##### NEVADA

Virginia M. Rowe, Ruth, Nev., in place of I. W. Van Camp, deceased.

##### NEW JERSEY

Andree M. Schroeder, Lincoln Park, N. J., in place of F. W. Lyman, retired.  
Leora M. Wanamaker, Mahwah, N. J., in place of W. D. Finch, retired.  
Helen H. Stryker, Ringoes, N. J., in place of R. E. Berger, deceased.

##### NEW YORK

Donald J. Clark, Earlville, N. Y., in place of S. E. Morgan, resigned.  
Walter R. Ulmer, Treadwell, N. Y., in place of L. M. Oliver, retired.

##### OHIO

John R. Mericle, Bremen, Ohio, in place of C. T. Zwickel, retired.

Sam Verlenich, Jr., Warren, Ohio, in place of R. E. Schryver, retired.

##### OKLAHOMA

Jack H. Justice, Maysville, Okla., in place of B. C. Sparks, transferred.

##### PENNSYLVANIA

Clark H. Freas, Falls, Pa., in place of B. M. Durland, retired.  
Albert F. Hilliard, Horsham, Pa., in place of W. S. Knipe, resigned.  
Claude B. Faust, Macungie, Pa., in place of F. E. Neumeyer, removed.  
Earl G. Smith, Mont Clare, Pa., in place of C. R. Miller, deceased.  
George Cassett, Somerset, Pa., in place of O. F. Sutcliffe, removed.  
Herbert E. Readdy, Yeagertown, Pa., in place of E. L. Middleswarth, retired.

##### PUERTO RICO

Pablo Pedraza, Barranquitas, P. R., in place of Ricardo Pagan, retired.

##### SOUTH CAROLINA

Bennett C. Bedenbaugh, Prosperity, S. C., in place of J. M. Bedenbaugh, retired.

##### SOUTH DAKOTA

Lyman L. Blich, Cavour, S. Dak., in place of Josephine Tompers, deceased.  
George H. Fryde, Keystone, S. Dak., in place of J. L. Manion, retired.

##### TENNESSEE

Louis W. Oliver, Jr., Hendersonville, Tenn., in place of E. B. Weisiger, retired.  
Molly L. Casteel, Mosheim, Tenn., in place of L. F. Robinette, resigned.  
Carl A. Thompson, Pleasant Hill, Tenn., in place of L. C. Treadway, resigned.  
Luther L. Martin, Silver Point, Tenn., in place of A. H. Gill, transferred.

##### VERMONT

Carlton O. Tarbox, Orleans, Vt., in place of C. E. Jenkins, retired.  
James H. Watson, Taftsville, Vt., in place of H. O. Dietrich, retired.

##### VIRGINIA

Harland B. Little, Jr., Blacksburg, Va., in place of W. W. Argabrite, resigned.  
James E. Brunner, Riner, Va., in place of G. J. Akers, retired.

##### WEST VIRGINIA

Arnold Grant Porterfield, Bluefield, W. Va., in place of M. S. Smith, resigned.  
Charles Manning Smith, Charles Town, W. Va., in place of T. T. Perry, Jr., retired.  
John Samuel Stewart, Hundred, W. Va., in place of A. F. Cole, retired.

##### WISCONSIN

Arthur J. Reeths, Marshfield, Wis., in place of T. F. McDonald, retired.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 27, 1956:

##### POSTMASTER

##### ALASKA

Everett J. Wilde, College.  
Margaret P. Bohrer, Nome.  
June E. Hutchinson, Whittier.

##### ARIZONA

Ethel M. Green, Gila Bend.

##### CALIFORNIA

Clarence E. Farrin, Azusa.  
William H. O'Neill, Rosamond.  
Eugene P. Guenther, Shafter.  
Ilah M. Odem, Silverado.

##### COLORADO

Minta E. Gerry, Rangely.

##### CONNECTICUT

Camillo Altieri, Jr., Bantam.  
Frederick D. Parker, Clinton.

##### DELAWARE

Herbert C. Whitney, Magnolia.

## GEORGIA

James M. Cox, Whigham.

## IDAHO

Martha W. Cook, Tetonia.

## INDIANA

Robert M. Brett, Shoals.

## IOWA

Gerald J. Andersen, Gilmore City.  
Donald G. Burt, Polk City.  
Earl E. Cowden, Sidney.

## KANSAS

Bernice F. Harvey, Lenexa.  
Glen L. Jenkins, Reserve.  
Clarence M. McClelland, Studley.

## LOUISIANA

Lottie E. Viguerie, Charenton.

## MAINE

Everett A. Beal, Ellsworth Falls.  
Paul C. Shaver, Stockton Springs.

## MARYLAND

Alfred C. Huffer, Jr., Boonsboro.  
Arthur F. Hightman, Brunswick.  
Edmund W. Rodgers, Glen Burnie.  
Stanley S. Sentman, Port Deposit.

## MASSACHUSETTS

Alfred E. Pineau, Westport Point.

## MICHIGAN

Viberta M. Martin, Bancroft.  
Frank R. Sweeney, Bay City.  
Arthur J. Jackson, Benton Harbor.  
Charles A. Fisher, Bergland.  
Harriet H. Tuttle, Comstock.  
Carl R. Sterner, Dryden.  
DeRossa A. Essex, Essexville.  
Donald H. Hutchins, Glenn.  
Mary M. Schlichting, Haslett.  
Robert W. Dullinger, Hubbard Lake.  
Alfred J. Pini, Hubbell.  
Mason Holmes, Idlewild.  
Daniel G. Picot, Lexington.  
Arthur G. Jenkins, Livonia.  
Richard F. Minzey, McBain.  
John P. Danielson, Michigamme.  
Rolla B. Crandell, Northstar.  
William L. Osborne, Prescott.  
David L. Bellinger, Rosebush.  
William F. Kunst, St. Clair Shores.  
John E. Luttmann, Sturgis.  
Alice L. Thompson, Trout Creek.  
Burr D. Eveleth, Jr., Uby.  
Alice R. Cox, Willis.

## MISSISSIPPI

Alva G. Edmondson, Edwards.  
S. T. Gray, Jr., New Augusta.

## MONTANA

Charles P. Rapos, Fallon.

## NEBRASKA

Enoch D. Long, Chappell.  
Robert B. Shaw, Guide Rock.  
Gilbert R. Fletcher, Hoskins.  
Gerald E. Brown, Kenesaw.  
Joel A. Schleiger, Overton.  
Elmer R. Henkel, Ralston.  
Leland D. Dewitz, Wisner.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mary W. Britton, Westmoreland.

## NEW JERSEY

Anita Grace King, Allenhurst.  
Francis J. Kiernan, Glen Ridge.  
Raymond F. Woolf, Kingston.  
Ralph F. Barra, Lake Hiawatha.  
Daniel M. McArdle, Passaic.

## NORTH CAROLINA

Charles L. Alexander, Kings Mountain.  
Robert A. Liles, Lilesville.  
Ida R. Irvine, Tarheel.

## NORTH DAKOTA

Harold N. Gauthier, Williston.

## OKLAHOMA

Glenn M. Moore, Morris.  
Winslow W. Campbell, Stonewall.

## PENNSYLVANIA

Thomas R. Lostrick, Ernest.  
Rachel S. Rodgers, Hokendauqua.  
Irvin R. MacMullen, King of Prussia.  
William H. Hunsinger, Lattimer Mines.  
Dolores P. Mattchak, Lopez.  
Violet F. Nelson, Minisink Hills.  
Catherine M. Viola, Morgan.  
Waldo L. Dyson, Sr., Pocono Pines.  
Kenneth E. West, Spring House.  
Paul E. Ness, Yoe.

## TENNESSEE

Willie L. Newberry, Gleason.

## TEXAS

Donald L. Morrison, Throckmorton.

## VERMONT

Florence H. Tute, Newport Center.

## VIRGINIA

Robert J. Bradshaw, Rice.  
Ruth G. Walden, Saluda.

## WISCONSIN

Helen J. Mayne, Browntown.  
Wallace Gordon Yadon, Delavan.  
Ralph A. Nelson, Superior.

## WYOMING

I. Isabell Schwab, Hawk Springs.

## WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from  
the Senate, June 27, 1956:

## POSTMASTER

Narvol A. Randol to be postmaster at Cape  
Girardeau, in the State of Missouri.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 27, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.  
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp,  
D. D., offered the following prayer:Almighty God, may the hours of this  
new day upon which we have entered be  
rich and radiant in the realization of Thy  
presence, Thy peace, and Thy power.Grant that, as the stewards of time and  
of talents, we may seek, in faithful ser-  
vice, to bring to fulfillment and fruition  
every noble aspiration and longing which  
Thou hast planted within our souls.We pray that when we are fearful for  
our safety and security and seem to be  
the victims of a conspiracy of evil cir-  
cumstances, we may lay hold of those  
moral resources which will make us equal  
to the demands of any occasion.Impart unto us a larger measure of the  
gifts of spiritual vision which will enable  
us to look beyond the present perils to  
Thy all-encompassing grace and good-  
ness.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yes-  
terday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr.  
McBride, one of its clerks, announced  
that the Senate had passed, with amend-  
ments in which the concurrence of the  
House is requested, a bill of the House  
of the following title:H. R. 10986. An act making appropriations  
for the Department of Defense for the fiscal  
year ending June 30, 1957, and for other  
purposes.The message also announced that the  
Senate insists upon its amendments to  
the foregoing bill and requests a confer-  
ence with the House on the disagree-  
ing votes of the two Houses thereon, and  
appoints Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr.  
RUSSELL, Mr. HILL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. SAL-  
TONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. FLANDERS  
to be the conferees on the part of the  
Senate.The message also announced that the  
Vice President had appointed the Sen-  
ator from Mississippi, Mr. STENNIS, the  
Senator from West Virginia, Mr. NEELY,  
and the Senator from South Dakota, Mr.  
CASE, to the National Memorial Stadium  
Commission, authorized by Public Law  
523, 78th Congress.

## FREE OR REDUCED RATE TRANSPORTATION TO MINISTERS OF RELIGION

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask  
unanimous consent to take from the  
Speaker's table the bill (S. 3149) to  
amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938  
in order to permit air carriers to grant  
free or reduced rate transportation to  
ministers of religion, with a House  
amendment thereto, insist on the House  
amendment and agree to the conference  
asked by the Senate.The SPEAKER. Is there objection to  
the request of the gentleman from Ten-  
nessee? [After a pause.] The Chair  
hears none, and appoints the following  
conferees: MESSRS. HARRIS, CARLYLE, MACK  
of Illinois, WOLVERTON, and HINSHAW.

## NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the pro-  
visions of Public Law 523, 78th Congress,  
the Chair appoints as members of the  
National Memorial Stadium Commission  
the following Members on the part of the  
House: Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey;  
Mr. LANKFORD, of Maryland; and Mr.  
KEARNS, of Pennsylvania.

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I call up  
the conference report on the bill (H. R.  
10003) making appropriations for the  
government of the District of Columbia  
and other activities chargeable in whole  
or in part against the revenues of said  
District, for the fiscal year ending June  
30, 1957, and for other purposes, and ask  
unanimous consent that the statement  
of the managers on the part of the  
House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to  
the request of the gentleman from  
Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement  
are as follows:

## CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2484)

The committee of conference on the dis-  
agreeing votes of the two Houses on the  
amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R.  
10003) making appropriations for the gov-  
ernment of the District of Columbia and